DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 393 CS 500 955

AUTHOR Meyer, Arthur C.
TITLE A Survey of Speech Programs in Community Colleges.
PUB DATE May 73
NOTE 239p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Missouri

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$12.05 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Instruction; Communication (Thought Transfer); Doctoral Theses; Educational Research; *Junior Colleges; National Surveys; *School Surveys; *Speech Curriculum; *Speech Education; Speech Instruction

ABSTRACT

The rapid growth of community colleges in the last decade resulted in large numbers of students enrolled in programs previously unavailable to them in a single comprehensive institution. The purpose of this study was to gather and analyze data to provide information about the speech programs that community colleges created or expanded as a result of the sharp increase in enrollment. Specifically, several aspects of community college speech programs were surveyed: departmental organization, role and function of the chairman, staff, courses, activities, and rationale for the speech program in a community college. Analysis of the data indicates that speech programs are well established as integral parts of community colleges with courses similar to those offered in the first two years of four-year institutions. However, most of these speech programs do not include courses other than those parallel to university courses for students in occupational, continuing education, or remedial curricula. Colleges with 5,000 or more students outranked the smaller colleges in almost every area in which significant differences emerged. Other results and comprehensive recommendations are provided, along with complete statistical data. (TO)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED101393

A SURVEY OF SPEECH PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPY
RIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Arthur C. Meyer
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING
UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL IN
STITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRO
DUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM RE
QUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT
OWNER

by

Arthur C. Meyer

May 1973

James W. Gibson Dissertation Supervisor

AS 500 .M55

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For Nasja, whose encouragement and support
were constant,

And Joseph and Jasna, who helped
because they are.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purposes of Study	6
Definition of Terms	6
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
Introduction	9
Studies of Speech Programs in Community Colleges	11
III. METHOD, RESULTS, AND INTERPRETATION	21
Results	24
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	164
Summary	165
Conclusion	171
Recommendations	176
BIBLIOGRAPHY	191
APPENDIX	195

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Responses to Questionnaire	25
2.	Departments and Divisions	27
3.	Departments Specifically for the Speech Program	30
4.	Department Titles	33
5.	Speech and Theatre Courses in Same Department	37
6.	Opinions on Separate Departments for the Speech Program	40
7.	Title of Chairman of the Speech Program	44
8.	Reduced Teaching Load for Department Chairman	47
9.	Percentage of Teaching Load for Chairman	49
10.	Chairman's Responsibilities: Budgeting, Scheduling, Recruiting	53
11.	Chairman's Responsibilities: Evaluation of Staff	56
12.	Staff: Normal Teaching Load	60
13.	Compensation for Out-of-Class Responsibilities	63
14.	Method of Compensation for Out-of-Class Responsibilities	66
15.	Professional Training of Staff	70
16.	Full and Part Time Staff	73
17.	Staff Enrolled in Graduate Programs	76
18.	Staff Enrolled in Ph.D. Programs and Other Graduate Programs	80

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE		PAGE
19.	Full Time Staff Teaching the Basic Speech Course	83
20.	Membership in Professional Associations	86
21.	Membership in Speech Communication Association	89
22.	Expected Staff Increases	93
23.	Graduate Programs for Community College Teachers	96
24.	Number of Sections of Basic Speech Course Per Semester	99
25.	Average Class Size in Basic Speech Course	102
26.	Emphasis of the Basic Speech Course	105
27.	Departmental Syllabus for the Basic Speech Course	108
28.	Statement of Objectives for the Basic Speech Course	111
29.	Behavioral Terms in Statement of Objectives	114
30.	Enrollment in Speech and Theatre Courses	117
31.	Speech Program Similarity with Four-Year Institutions	120
32.	Speech Courses Other Than University Parallel	123
33.	Availability of Majors in Speech and Drama	126
34.	Average Number of Credit Hours in the Speech Program	129
35.	Average Number of Different Courses in the Speech Program	131
36.	Percentage of Courses in Theatre or Drama within the Speech Program	133
37.	Availability and Frequency of a Basic Course in Theatre	137
38.	Theatre Productions	141
39.	Average Number of Theatre Productions	144

TABLE PAGE

40. College Credit for Participation in Theatre Productions 145
41. Physical Facility for Theatre Productions 148
42. Intercollegiate Forensic Activities 151
43. College Credit for Participation in Forensic Activities 155
44. Staff Time Used for Activities 158
45. Compensation for Staff Time Used for Activities 161

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1968 a leading community college educator observed that fifty new two-year colleges were being established annually.[1] These colleges, usually referred to as community colleges, represent a new dimension in higher education in the United States. In many respects, they are unlike traditional higher educational institutions, and are not well understood. The mission of community colleges encompasses an attempt to satisfy most of the educational needs of the community that are not met by other educational institutions.

Community colleges are frequently misunderstood because they have neither tradition nor parallel in higher education. Their recent arrival has been described without heraldry:

> As newcomers in the field of education, they lack the status and prestige of the older four-year institutions. Academic snobs tend to view them as a last resort--The public community colleges for dullards, a handful of fancy junior colleges as finishing schools renamed.[2]

Understanding of community colleges will develop as more persons come into contact with them, and as researchers explain their purposes and programs to the educational community.

---

[1]Joseph P. Cosand, "The Community College in 1980," Campus 1980 (New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1968), p. 134.

[2]Ibid., p. 136.

The development of American community colleges in the twentieth century is a widely recognized phenomenon. The decade of 1960 to 1970 marked an unprecedented period of increasing enrollment, with 660,216 students enrolled in 1960 and 2,499,837 in 1970.[3] In the same ten years, the number of two year colleges grew from 678 to 1,091.[4] New colleges recruited faculties and launched programs at an incredibly fast pace. Colleges already in existence modified and expanded their curricula. This rapid growth allowed little time for introspection, and research lagged far behind the new colleges and their programs. One program that participated in this period of great expansion, the speech program, is the subject of this dissertation.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The growth of community colleges represents more than a numerical change in higher education in the United States. These colleges are characterized by open-door admission policies, and by efforts to provide comprehensive educational programs. The open-door policy attempts to provide universal access to persons who seek post-secondary educational opportunities. The comprehensive programs attempt to meet the needs of the diverse student population enrolling in the community colleges. Thus, in addition to programs intended to prepare a student to transfer

---

[3]William A. Harper (ed.), 1971 Junior College Directory (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971), p. 6.

[4]Ibid.

to four-year institutions for upper division work, the community college offers vocational and technical programs, compensatory programs to help students overcome academic deficiencies, community service programs, and general education programs. The intent of the community college is to provide students with a wide range of options.

The rapid growth of community colleges in the last decade resulted in large numbers of students enrolled in programs previously unavailable to them in a single comprehensive institution. These programs are in operation, but little is known about them. Many were developed in new institutions, with staff and students who had neither tradition nor analogous experience to guide them. This investigator attempted to gather and analyze data to provide information about the speech programs that community colleges created, or expanded, as a result of the sharp increase in enrollment.

Specifically, this investigator surveyed several aspects of community college speech programs. These aspects were (1) departmental organization, (2) role and function of the chairman, (3) staff, (4) courses, (5) activities, and (6) rationale for the speech program in a community college. The purpose of this study was to provide information that will increase understanding of speech programs in community colleges.

The case for the need for additional information in the area of community colleges, and in the speech field in particular, can be supported from many sources. Karl Wallace, in his study A History of

Speech Education in America, recognized the importance of continued research in all areas of speech education: "Before a final history of speech education can be prepared, we need the work of many future scholars who will furnish the facts as to who taught what, and where and how."[5] This investigator gathered and analyzed data to help furnish some of these facts.

A statement in the 1971 Junior College Directory maintained: "As the community junior college moves into the decade of the seventies there will be an ever-increasing need for accurate and extensive data regarding individual institutions."[6] The data presented in this study provide an opportunity for individual institutions to compare their speech programs with other programs in similar institutions.

Recent investigators of speech programs in community and junior colleges also acknowledge the need for more information. Roy Berko, in a 1971 doctoral dissertation, observed:

> Due to the newness and quickly changing role of the community-junior college, little research or study has been made of certain curricula, services, and programs which such an institution may encompass. . . . The field of speech at the community-junior college level is an example of a subject matter on which there is limited research.[7]

---

[5]Karl R. Wallace (ed.), History of Speech Education in America (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), p. v.

[6]Harper, p. 7.

[7]Roy M. Berko, "Speech Programs at Coeducational Community-Junior Colleges" (unpublished Doctoral thesis, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1971), pp. 1-2.

In a similar study in 1967, Carolyn Roberts stated:

> In the rapidly growing educational institution known as the junior college, this aspect of speech research offers unlimited opportunities to persons interested in both education and speech. Nearly every aspect of speech at the junior college level is open for examination, yet there has been little investigation of the current status of speech in the junior college.[8]

Anita Taylor, in an article in The Speech Teacher, observed that "very little study has been devoted to the tasks and problems of speech and theatre curriculum development in the community college."[9]

The Speech Communication Association recently recognized the need for more attention to the emerging community colleges. At the annual convention in 1971, it commissioned a standing committee to explore speech communication education in community colleges.

In summary, the need for this study focused in three areas: the information can provide a better understanding of the total field of speech education; it can be helpful to community colleges currently in operation; and it can be helpful to colleges that will begin operation in the seventies. These colleges can assess how their speech programs compare with the programs of similar institutions in the United States.

---

[8]Carolyn M. Roberts, "A Survey of Speech Education in United States Junior Colleges" (unpublished Master's thesis, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, 1967), p. 116.

[9]Anita Taylor, "Speech and Theatre in Public Community Colleges, 1968-69," The Speech Teacher, XIX (January, 1970), 62.

PURPOSES OF STUDY

The purposes of the study are: (1) to assess the status of speech programs in community colleges; (2) to identify trends that have developed or are developing which affect these programs; (3) to compare speech programs in two size groups of institutions, 2,000 to 4,999 and more than 5,000; (4) to compare speech programs in community colleges in different regions of the country; (5) to provide information to aid new and growing community colleges to evaluate certain aspects of their speech programs.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following definitions indicate the meaning of several key terms, which appear frequently throughout the study.

Speech Program: All areas traditionally associated with the "field of speech." It includes, but is not limited to, fundamentals, speech-communication, theatre, public speaking, interpretation, radio and television, speech and hearing disorders, forensics, debate, and speech education.

Community College: A two-year, public institution with comprehensive educational programs including both transfer and occupational curricula.

Chairman of the Speech Program: The person, recognized officially or unofficially, who performs administrative tasks such as class scheduling, budget planning, or staff evaluation.

Staff for the Speech Program: All persons whose major responsibility in the community college is in one or more of the areas traditionally associated with the "field of speech." Staff thus includes persons who teach the basic speech course, other speech courses, theatre courses, or who work primarily in forensic or theatre production activities.

Other terms requiring explanation are "Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students," and "Colleges with 5,000 or more students." The rationale for the minimum number of 2,000 students included several factors: community colleges with 2,000 or more students accounted for 73 per cent of all students enrolled in two-year institutions at the time of the survey; the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, in its report The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges, recommended a minimum of 2,000 students to enable a college to "provide a rounded program at reasonable cost";[10] the likelihood is great that community colleges with 2,000 or more students will continue to represent the majority of students and faculty in two-year institutions. The "5,000 or more" concept was also derived from the Carnegie Commission report, which stated that a community college with more than 5,000 students "will compound unnecessarily the problems of commuting and parking, and it will be less likely to be a part of any single neighborhood."[11]

---

[10]The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 2.

[11]Ibid.

The optimum number of students for a community college, according to this report, is 2,000 to 5,000 students. Chapter III contains additional information about the selection of colleges included in this survey.

---

[11] Ibid.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Research on speech programs in community or junior colleges is not extensive. Of the studies completed, only a few attempted to gather data and provide information about these programs on a national scale; none attempted to survey speech programs in comprehensive community colleges with enrollments of 2,000 or more. Most previous studies of speech programs in two-year institutions emphasized either a single aspect of the program, or investigated a problem within a single state or region of the country. The limited research on speech programs in community or junior colleges, as well as the limited research on the institutions themselves, can be partially explained by their inconspicuous beginning.

For the first half of the twentieth century, these two-year institutions enrolled a small number of students within the total college enrollment in the country. Because they seemed not to be in the mainstream of the educational development of the country, these colleges attracted little attention from scholars and critics. One writer recently observed the "two year college, despite the history of more than half a century, has only within the last ten years emerged as a significant contributor to the educational process."[1] When

---

[1]Clyde E. Blocker et. al., The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), p. 2.

enrollment began to grow at a rapid rate, in the decade of the sixties, research projects investigating these colleges and their educational programs increased.

The emerging community colleges attracted both praise and criticism from observers. John W. Gardner stated: "The greatest American educational invention of the twentieth century is the two-year community college."[2] Conversely, a Ford Foundation Task Force Report published a less complimentary assessment:

> The 'junior college scenario' is thus one of the transformation of community institutions into amorphous, bland, increasingly large, increasingly State-dominated, 2-year institutions which serve a number of interests other than that of their own students.[3]

In the midst of its defenders and attackers, and a large number of disinterested parties, the community college continued to grow as it entered the decade of the seventies. The time had arrived for introspection, for evaluation of the educational programs offered by the community college. To assess the current status of speech programs in the community college, it was helpful to return to earlier studies on the subject.

---

[2]John W. Gardner, No Easy Victories (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968), pp. 95-96.

[3]Report on Higher Education, A Report Prepared by a Ford Foundation Task Force (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 59.

STUDIES OF SPEECH PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Courses in speech in the junior college were offered in the early days of junior college history. In a 1921 survey of junior colleges, Leonard Koos reported speech was a part of the curriculum, and an average of 2.9 semester hours of credit was offered.[4] Two surveys, completed in 1924 and 1928, were reported in a study in The Quarterly Journal of Speech in 1931. This study also represented the first attempt to survey speech programs in the junior colleges in a comprehensive manner. J. Richard Bietry, author of the report, presented information on departmental organization, staff, courses, objectives, extra-curricular activities, and other related areas.[5] Bietry indicated a growth in the average number of semester hours in speech from 2.9 in 1924 to 10.6 in 1928.[6] His study is the most comprehensive survey of speech from the early period of junior college development. Ten years passed before publication of another study of speech programs in junior colleges. The lack of publications in the area can be considered evidence of general disinterest on the part of researchers in speech education.

---

[4]Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College Movement (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925).

[5]Richard Bietry, "The Junior College in Relation to Speech Education," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XVII (April, 1931), 206.

[6]Ibid., p. 206.

Meanwhile, another study, published in 1931, investigated the junior college as an institution, rather than the speech program specifically. In this study, Walter Eells reported the average number of semester hours of speech was 6.2.[7]

The next survey that emphasized speech in junior colleges was a project of the Works Progress Administration. It was completed in 1938 and was reported in The Quarterly Journal of Speech.

Sylvia Mariner undertook this survey to provide information to guide the development of speech programs in junior colleges in the state of Oklahoma. Mariner reported general information about speech programs in junior colleges. She also presented specific information in several areas: forensics, reading and dramatics, radio speech, and extra-curricular speech activities. She observed that "speech activities are outstanding in a large number of junior colleges," and ". . . there is a growing consciousness on the part of speech teachers and administrative officials that greater emphasis should be placed on speech activities."[8] In reference to junior colleges that had not developed adequate speech programs, Mariner reported a lack of time and money seemed to be the causal factors.[9]

---

[7]Walter C. Eells, The Junior College (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1931), p. 489.

[8]Sylvia D. Mariner, "Speech Survey of Junior Colleges," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIX (April, 1938), 239.

[9]Ibid.

In 1941 Arthur Brewington completed a study, "A Survey of Speech Education in the American Junior College." His purpose was to describe the speech curriculum in junior colleges, and to analyze and describe the current practices of teaching speech in the junior college.[10] To indicate the need for his study, Brewington observed:

> The rapid growth of the American junior college in the last forty years has made it necessary to determine more definitely the functions it is to perform in our system of education and to establish the field in which it is to operate.[11]

It is noteworthy that Brewington referred to the rapid growth of junior colleges as early as 1941. He reported speech programs in junior colleges were growing in importance, and between 1924 and 1940 the average number of semester hours in speech in public and private junior colleges increased from 3.0 to 9.0. The two largest areas of study, according to Brewington, were public speaking and dramatics. He also reported public junior colleges offered an average of 12.71 semester hours of speech. Brewington commented that the objective of the junior college speech course seemed to be terminal in nature, rather than preparatory as it was in the universities.[12] In his study, Brewington provided an overview of speech programs in junior colleges in the period immediately prior to World War II.

---

[10]Arthur W. Brewington, "A Survey of Speech Education in the American Junior College," Abstract from Contribution to Education No. 292 (Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1941), pp. 1-13.

[11]Ibid.

[12]Ibid.

Another survey of speech in junior colleges, published in 1943, reported the average semester hours of speech credit had decreased to 8.6.[13] In this study, P. Merville Larson attributed the decrease in enrollment to the war. Larson also reviewed the literature on speech education in junior colleges, which prompted him to report that scholars and educators in the field of speech were indifferent to speech programs in junior colleges.[14]

Approximately 24 years passed before another national survey of speech in junior colleges was undertaken and completed. This period included two of the years of World War II, and the post-war period, during which most of the energy and attention of the country was devoted to other tasks. During this period the comprehensive community college replaced the junior college as the major two-year educational institution.

In 1967, Carolyn M. Roberts completed a thesis, "A Survey of Speech Education in United States Junior Colleges." Roberts stated her study was designed "to examine the current status of specific aspects of speech education in all junior colleges in the United States."[15] The aspects that Roberts investigated were: the avail-

---

[13]P. Merville Larson, "The Junior College: A Challenge to Speech Educators," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIV (December, 1943), 499.

[14]Ibid.

[15]Carolyn M. Roberts, "A Survey of Speech Education in United States Junior Colleges" (unpublished Master's thesis, Purdue University, 1967), p. vii.

ability and kinds of speech courses, the departmentalization of the speech programs, and the staff. Roberts mailed a one page questionnaire to 837 junior colleges, the total number of two year colleges in operation at the time of her study. She reported 544 colleges, 65 per cent of the total, returned usable questionnaires. The respondents indicated speech courses were usually located in the English department, with the second most frequent location speech departments. Roberts also reported 32 per cent of the colleges responding did not employ a full time speech teacher, and 48 per cent of all junior college speech teachers were employed part time.[16]

Another study, completed in 1968, has not been published, but was made available through the national office of the Speech Communication Association. This study, "Speech in the Junior Colleges of Our Fifty States and the District of Columbia," was completed by Marceline Erickson of Voorheen College. She surveyed the speech courses offered in junior colleges, using college catalogues as sources of information.

Erickson divided the country into four regions, representing each of the regional speech associations. She included a course by course listing, in tabulated form, indicating how many junior colleges offered each specific course in each region of the country. She reported the most prevalent speech course in junior colleges was public speaking, and she concluded speech in the junior college is a "level of speech

---

[16]Ibid., p. 96.

education which offers opportunity for almost boundless additional research." The chief limitation of Erickson's study was that it emphasized only the courses reported by college catalogues. But the information on the courses was thorough; it provided an overview of what was listed in speech in junior college catalogues in 1968.

The next survey of speech programs in junior colleges was completed in 1969, and reported in the January, 1970 issue of The Speech Teacher. In this article, "Speech and Theatre in Public Community Colleges 1968-69," Anita Taylor reported on speech and theatre courses, on the level of the courses, on the hours of credit offered, and on the intercollegiate debate programs in the colleges included in her study. Taylor used catalogues and questionnaires as sources of information. She included in her study a limited number of states rather than the entire country. She selected states "which led their region of the country in community college development."[17] These states were California, Texas, Illinois, Ohio, New York, and Florida.

Taylor drew the following conclusions in her report:

> (1) courses offered are primarily in the university parallel curriculum; (2) colleges within each state seem to resemble each other; (3) there is great disparity of course offerings from one region of the country to another; (4) the staff teaching speech and theatre is limited and the schools are small.

Taylor also concluded little innovation seemed evident in the speech programs in community colleges.[18]

---

[17]Anita Taylor, "Speech and Theatre in Community Colleges," The Speech Teacher, XIX (January, 1970), 62.

[18]Ibid.

Taylor provided an overview of speech courses being offered in community colleges in the selected states, but her study was limited in several ways. The colleges were selected from states where community college development was well advanced; thus the results would probably differ from a survey that included all states. The study was based primarily on information related to the courses. Another limitation was that Taylor included all community and junior colleges in the selected states in her study. This approach tended to overweight the significance of very small community and junior colleges, including new institutions that had not yet developed speech programs and staff.

The only major study that attempted to yield comprehensive data on speech programs in community and junior colleges in recent years was Roy Berko's dissertation, "Speech Programs at Coeducational Community-Junior Colleges." Berko stated the purpose of his study was "to help fill a gap in present educational information by collecting, tabulating, analyzing, and evaluating data concerning speech education in community-junior colleges."[19] To gather his data, Berko used an exhaustive 67 page questionnaire mailed to a random sample of 172 coeducational two-year institutions in the United States. Of this number, 109 institutions representing 63 per cent of the sample, returned usable questionnaires. Berko reported information in the following

---

[19]Roy M. Berko, "Speech Programs at Coeducational Community-Junior Colleges" (unpublished Doctoral thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1971), p. 5.

areas: courses, teaching, administrative structure, staff, extra-curricular programs, equipment, community services, testing methods, program evaluation, national organization membership, recent changes, influence of four-year institutions, student attitudes, research, and scholarship funds.[20] Berko included observations and recommendations based on his own experiences as a teacher and supervisor of speech programs in the community college.

Berko reported a large number of conclusions in his study. Following are several selected items that summarize some of his major conclusions:

> 1. Almost all schools offer courses specifically identified as speech courses.
> 2. A speech program servicing between 101 and 500 students per academic year seems to be most typical.
> 3. Most of the schools offer a drama program which, in general, is administered as part of the speech program.
> 4. Over one-half of the responding schools indicated that 75 to 100 per cent of the total speech courses taught were within the Fundamentals offering.
> 5. The general trend seems to be that the larger the school, the greater the number of speech instructors.
> 6. The normal teaching load for two-thirds of the reporting schools was 15 credit hours.
> 7. Almost no research is being done by instructors in the field of speech in the community-junior colleges.
> 8. Over 90 per cent of the schools indicated that official policy statements of their institutions included a statement of community-service orientation. In less than one-fourth of the colleges, however, did the respondent indicate that the curricular speech program at the college was to a great extent related to the interests and needs of the community in which the institution was located.[21]

---

[20] Ibid., p. 7.

[21] Ibid., pp. 115-34.

In his effort to report on all public, coeducational junior colleges, Berko did not provide information that can be applied to any specific kind or size of two year college. His study was limited by the attempt to include all public, coeducational junior colleges, regardless of whether they were large enough to support a speech program, or whether they ascribed to a comprehensive community college philosophy.

In addition to the studies reviewed in the present chapter, several studies on limited aspects of speech programs in community and junior colleges have been completed. These studies frequently emphasized a single aspect of the speech program,[22] or were limited to a single state or region of the country.[23]

In summary, the literature reviewed in this chapter revealed a recent interest in the community college as a significant and growing

---

[22]Irene Childrey Hoch, "Aims of Speech Training in the Junior College," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIX (June, 1933), 369-74; Russell R. Johnston, "Speech Activities in Junior Colleges," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIX (June, 1933), 375-79; P. Merville Larson, "Speech Courses for the Junior College Terminal Curricula," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIX (October, 1943), 360-62; Dolores M. Abrams, editor, Theatre in the Junior College (Washington, D.C.: American Educational Theatre Association, 1964); Don Frair, "Methods and Trends in the Junior College Basic Speech Course," Western Speech, XXXIV (Spring, 1970), 148-53.

[23]Carl William Kranish, "A Study of the Current Speech Programs of Eleven Michigan Junior Colleges," Speech Monographs, XVII (August, 1950), 122-27; Wayne O. Fox and Thorrel B. Fest, "The Status of Speech in Western Junior Colleges," The Speech Teacher, I (September, 1952), 199-203; Arthur Eisenstadt, "Speech Education Survey on New Jersey Junior Colleges," The Speech Teacher, II (November, 1953), 273-82; Ben Padrow, "Speech Education in the California Junior Colleges," The Speech Teacher, VIII (January, 1959), 58-62; Ray E. Collins, "Junior College Speech Curriculum," Western Speech, XXV (Summer, 1961), 153-56; Win Kelley, "Speech--Status, Trends, Innovations in California," Junior College

force in higher education, and limited research on speech programs in community and junior colleges. Although several researchers within the past five years have investigated areas similar to this study, none has emphasized the speech programs in the institutions where most two-year college students and faculty are located, the large, public, community colleges.

Journal, XL (April, 1970), 27-29; Win Kelley, "Speech Instruction in California Community Colleges," The Speech Teacher, XIX (September, 1970), 211-24; Mary Anne Adams, "A Survey of the Status of Speech Education in the Public Two-Year Colleges of Missouri As They Compare to Other Missouri Colleges," Missouri Speech Journal, I (April, 1971), 29-38.

CHAPTER III

METHOD, RESULTS, AND INTERPRETATION

After selecting the problem, the following steps were employed in the research in this study.

1. A descriptive assessment of speech programs in large community colleges required factual data from a large number of colleges. Therefore, the questionnaire seemed to be a logical instrument to accumulate the desired information.

2. An examination of questionnaires used in recent studies of speech in junior and community colleges, and also of English in these colleges,[1] provided guidelines for both the content and the format of the instrument used in this study. Prior to adoption of the instrument, a pilot study was conducted.

3. Criteria were specified for selection of colleges included in the study. The criteria, drawn from the 1971 Junior College Directory, were: the colleges were public; they offered both transfer and occupational programs; they were coeducational; they enrolled 2,000 or more students. A total of 327 colleges, with an overall enrollment that accounted for 73 per cent of all students in two-year institutions, met the criteria.

---

[1]A Joint Project of The Modern Language Association, The National Council of Teachers of English, and The American Association of Junior Colleges, The National Study of English in the Junior College (New York: The ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English in Higher Education, Modern Language Association, 1970).

4. In the pilot study, speech department chairmen from 32 colleges were asked to evaluate and complete the questionnaire. Chairmen from 21 colleges responded, and many offered helpful suggestions used to revise the questionnaire. On the basis of the information provided in the pilot study, a final questionnaire (Appendix A, p. 196) was adopted.

5. Questionnaires were mailed to speech department chairmen at 327 community colleges in January, 1972. The 327 colleges included all colleges listed in the 1971 Junior College Directory that met the criteria for this study.

6. By early March, 1972, 177 colleges returned questionnaires. Of the 177 questionnaires, 175 contained usable responses. These 175 questionnaires represented a 53 per cent return from all surveyed colleges.

7. Data were analyzed and reported for the total number of colleges (175) returning usable responses to the questionnaire, and also for each of the variables included in the study. The variables were the two size groups of colleges, 2,000 to 4,999, and 5,000 or more, and the four different regions of the country as determined by the regional speech associations. Respondents included 104 colleges with 2,000-4,999 enrollment and 71 colleges with 5,000 or more enrollment (Table 1, p. 25). The regional distribution of respondents was: Central States, 48 colleges; Eastern States, 36 colleges; Southern States, 26 colleges; Western States, 65 colleges.

8. The data from the 2,000-4,999 size colleges were compared with the data from the 5,000 and over colleges; similarly, data from the four regions were compared. In the analysis of these variables, a chi-square test of significance was used (Appendix B, p. 202). The purpose of the test was to determine whether or not there were statistically significant differences between the variables. In the summaries that follow the discussion of the tables, frequent references to significant differences occur. These terms indicate statistically significant differences, based on the chi-square test set at a level of 0.05. Appendix B contains a summary of the chi-squares, keyed to the tables in this chapter, and to the questions from the instrument.

9. Responses to three open-ended items on the questionnaire were summarized and reported (Appendix E, p. 210). These three questions covered areas in which a wide range of responses could be expected: suggestions to improve graduate school programs to prepare teachers for community college speech programs; rationale for the speech program in a comprehensive, community college; and effects of the open-door admission policy on the speech program in the community college.

Description of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire (Appendix A, p. 196) included the following divisions: organizational information, role and responsibilities of the chairman of the speech program, staff, courses, activities, and rationale for the speech program in a community college. The total number of questions was 48, of which three were open-ended items. Two divisions of the questionnaire, staff and courses, required more questions than

other divisions. Twenty-seven questions, or two pages of the four page instrument, were devoted to these two areas.

The investigator provided a comprehensive definition of the term "Speech Program" as:

> . . . all areas traditionally associated with the 'field of speech.' It includes, but is not limited to, fundamentals, speech-communication, theatre, public speaking, interpretation, radio and television, speech and hearing disorders, forensics, debate, and speech education.

This definition was used to clarify and limit the data requested on the questionnaire.

RESULTS

Responses to the Questionnaire

Table 1 reports the data on the number of responses to the questionnaire. Of the total 327 questionnaires mailed, 177 were returned, and 175 contained usable answers. The usable responses from 175 colleges represent slightly more than a 53 per cent return from all colleges to which questionnaires were mailed. Of the 175 questionnaires returned (Table 1), 59 per cent (104) were from colleges with 2,000 to 4,999 students, and 41 per cent (71) were from colleges with more than 5,000 students. The regional distribution of responses includes 27 per cent (48) from Central States, 20 per cent (36) from Eastern States, 15 per cent (26) from Southern States, and 37 per cent (65) from Western States.

TABLE 1

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

REGION	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Central States	31	17.7	17	9.8	48	27.5
Eastern States	26	14.8	10	5.7	36	20.5
Southern States	17	9.8	9	5.1	26	14.9
Western States	30	17.1	35	20.0	65	37.1
Total	104	59.4	71	40.6	175	100.0

Departmental Organization: Departments and Divisions

The data reported in Table 2 provide an overview of departments and divisions in the college structure. Sixty per cent (104) of the reporting colleges included both administrative units. Of the colleges with 2,000-4,999 students, 60 per cent (62) reported they had departments and divisions, and colleges with 5,000 or more students also reported 60 per cent (48) had both units.

Regional distribution of responses to the question of including both departments and divisions within the college structure showed all four regions reporting a range of 55 to 64 per cent of colleges that had both units. There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions, in the use of departments and divisions within the college structure.

Departments and divisions within the same college are common structural units in a community college organizational plan. Respondents indicated this pattern exists in 60 per cent (104) of the colleges, and the pattern occurs about equally in both size groups of colleges, and in all regions of the country.

For colleges that included both administrative units, Table 2 also reports responses to the question, "Are 'Divisions' normally larger than 'Departments'?" Ninety-two per cent (96) reported that divisions were larger than departments. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 95 per cent (59) were larger, and colleges with more than 5,000 students reported 90 per cent (36) were larger. Regional distribution of responses showed all four regions reporting a range of 88 to 100

TABLE 2

DEPARTMENTS AND DIVISIONS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Colleges reporting both departments and divisions						
Yes	62	59.6	42	60.0	104	59.8
No	42	40.4	28	40.0	70	40.2
Total	104	100.0	70	100.0	174	100.0
Colleges reporting divisions as larger units than departments						
Yes	59	95.2	37	88.1	96	92.3
No	3	4.8	5	11.9	8	7.7
Total	62	100.0	42	100.0	104	100.0

TABLE 2 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Colleges reporting both departments and divisions										
Yes	27	55.1	23	63.9	15	62.5	39	60.0	104	59.8
No	22	44.9	13	36.1	9	37.5	26	40.0	70	40.2
Total	49	100.0	36	100.0	24	100.0	65	100.0	174	100.0
Colleges reporting divisions as larger units than departments										
Yes	25	92.6	23	100.0	14	93.3	34	87.2	96	92.3
No	2	7.4	0	0.0	1	6.7	5	12.8	8	7.7
Total	27	100.0	23	100.0	15	100.0	39	100.0	104	100.0

per cent of colleges in which divisions were larger units than departments.

The organizational pattern suggested by the results reinforces the thesis that divisions are normally larger units than departments. Speech departments in community colleges, consequently, will frequently be located within a larger administrative unit, called a division.

Departments Specifically for the Speech Program

Table 3 reports data on the number of institutions with departments specifically for the speech program. Fifty-three per cent (91) of the reporting colleges indicated they had departments specifically for the speech program. Of colleges with 2,000-4,999 students, 46 per cent (47) stated they had departments for the speech program, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 64 per cent (44) in that category.

Regional distribution of responses showed Central, Western, and Southern States with a range of 51 to 63 per cent, and Eastern States with 40 per cent (19) of colleges with departments specifically for the speech program.

There was a significant difference between colleges with 2,000-4,999 students and colleges with 5,000 or more students on this question. A significantly higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported departments specifically for the speech program. On the same question, there was no significant difference among the four regions.

TABLE 3

DEPARTMENTS SPECIFICALLY FOR THE SPEECH PROGRAM

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Colleges reporting departments specifically for the speech program						
Yes	47	45.6	44	63.8	91	52.9
No	56	54.4	25	36.2	81	47.1
Total	103	100.0	69	100.0	172	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Colleges reporting departments specifically for the speech program										
Yes	24	51.1	14	40.0	19	63.3	34	56.7	91	52.9
No	23	48.9	21	60.0	11	36.7	26	43.3	81	47.1
Total	47	100.0	35	100.0	30	100.0	60	100.0	172	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The results suggest that as community colleges become larger, there is a greater tendency to provide departments for the speech program. Since the status of department frequently increases autonomy in areas such as budgeting, staffing, and program planning, the speech programs in colleges with 5,000 or more students are probably more independent than their counterparts in smaller institutions. Another explanation is that as the colleges increase in size, the complexity of administrative problems requires organizational units such as departments.

Department Titles

The data in Table 4 show responses to the question, "What is the name of the department in which the speech program is organized?" (Six response categories were provided.) Ranked in order of frequency of response, the colleges reported: 38 per cent (65) did not select one of the title categories, and reported other (See Appendix C, p. 206); 21 per cent (36) reported Speech Department; 17 per cent (25) reported English Department; 8 per cent (13) reported Humanities Department; and 2 per cent (3) reported Speech-Communication Department.

Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported the following two titles as the most frequently used: other, 42 per cent (43), and English, 17 per cent (17). Colleges with more than 5,000 students reported Speech, 33 per cent (23), and other, 31 per cent (22) as the most used titles.

TABLE 4

DEPARTMENT TITLES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Department Titles:						
Speech Department	13	12.7	23	32.9	36	20.9
Speech-Drama	15	14.7	15	21.4	30	17.4
English	17	16.7	8	11.4	25	14.6
Humanities	11	10.8	2	2.9	13	7.6
Speech-Communication	3	2.9	0	0.0	3	1.7
Other	43	42.2	22	31.4	65	37.8
Total	102	100.0	70	100.0	172	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Department Titles:										
Speech Department	9	19.6	4	11.4	4	14.3	19	30.2	36	20.9
Speech-Drama	6	13.0	5	14.3	7	25.0	12	19.0	30	17.4
English	6	13.0	12	34.3	3	10.7	4	6.3	25	14.5
Humanities	3	6.6	5	14.3	1	3.6	4	6.3	13	7.6
Speech-Communication	0	0.0	2	5.7	1	3.6	0	0.0	3	1.7
Other	22	47.8	7	20.0	12	42.8	24	38.2	65	37.9
Total	46	100.0	35	100.0	28	100.0	63	100.0	172	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Regional distribution to the question of department titles showed the two titles most frequently used in each area as follows: Central States, 48 per cent (22) other, and 20 per cent (9) Speech Department; Eastern States, 34 per cent (12) English, and 20 per cent (7) other; Southern States, 43 per cent (12) other, and 25 per cent (7) Speech-Drama; Western States, 38 per cent (24) other, and 30 per cent (19) Speech Department. (Appendix C, p. 206 itemizes the responses in the category other.)

There was a significant difference between the two size groups in responses to the question of department titles. A significantly higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported the title of Speech Department. This use of the title Speech Department reflects the status of the department in the colleges with 5,000 or more students. As community colleges grow larger, the speech program gains recognition, both in terms of the status of the department (Table 3, p. 30) and the title used to designate the department.

Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges using the title Speech Department than other regions. Perhaps the more frequent usage of this title reflects the longer history of Western States' community colleges, especially in California. Eastern States reported a different situation, with a higher percentage of colleges using the title English Department to represent the speech program. Perhaps the longer history of a traditional approach to education in the Eastern States explains this difference.

Speech and Theatre Courses in Same Department

Table 5 reports responses to the question, "Are courses in theatre offered in the same administrative unit that offers other speech courses?" Responses indicated that 69 per cent (119) of the reporting colleges included speech and theatre courses in the same department. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 73 per cent (74) included speech and theatre courses in the same department, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 63 per cent (45) included both. The data show that speech and theatre courses are usually offered by the same department.

Regional distribution of responses indicated Central and Southern States included speech and theatre courses in the same department more often than Eastern and Western States. Specifically, Central States reported 83 per cent (40) of the departments included both, and Southern States reported 85 per cent (22). Eastern States reported 57 per cent (21), and Western States reported 58 per cent (36) included speech and theatre courses in the same department.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the question of speech and theatre courses in the same department. There was a significant difference, however, among the four regions. Southern and Central States reported significantly higher percentages of departments with both speech and theatre courses than Eastern and Western States.

Although there was no statistically significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the question of speech and

TABLE 5

SPEECH AND THEATRE COURSES IN SAME DEPARTMENT

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Colleges reporting speech and theatre courses in same department						
Yes	74	72.5	45	63.4	119	68.8
No	28	27.5	26	36.6	54	31.2
Total	102	100.0	71	100.0	173	100.0

TABLE 5 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Colleges reporting speech and theatre courses in same department										
Yes	40	83.3	21	56.8	22	84.6	36	58.1	119	68.8
No	8	16.7	16	43.2	4	15.4	26	41.9	54	31.2
Total	48	100.0	37	100.0	26	100.0	62	100.0	173	100.0

theatre courses in the same department, a higher percentage of colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported both courses within the same department. The lower percentage for the 5,000 or more group can be attributed to the increased use of departments in the larger colleges. One might infer that as community colleges grow larger, departments of drama frequently are separated from departments of speech.

The regional responses to the same question suggest a different interpretation. Eastern States reported a lower percentage of colleges with speech and theatre courses in the same department, but Eastern States also reported a higher percentage of colleges with no courses in theatre or drama (Table 36, p. 133). Western States, conversely, reported a lower percentage of departments with speech and theatre courses, but Western States also reported a higher percentage of colleges with a drama major (Table 33, p. 126). Western States apparently has many colleges in which theatre courses are offered in a separate department, probably a drama department.

Opinions on Separate Departments for the Speech Program

Table 6 reports responses to the question, "In your opinion, should the speech program in a community college be treated as a separate, single department?" Sixty-four per cent (104) of the respondents answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students replied 58 per cent (57) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 72 per cent (47) yes.

TABLE 6

OPINIONS ON SEPARATE DEPARTMENTS FOR THE SPEECH PROGRAM

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Should speech program be in a separate department						
Yes	57	58.2	47	72.3	104	63.8
No	41	41.8	18	27.7	59	36.2
Total	98	100.0	65	100.0	163	100.0

TABLE 6 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	
Should speech program be in a separate department										
Yes	26	56.6	28	80.0	13	52.0	37	64.9	104	63.8
No	20	43.4	7	20.0	12	48.0	20	35.1	59	36.2
Total	46	100.0	35	100.0	25	100.0	57	100.0	163	100.0

Regional distribution of responses to this question showed a range of 52 to 80 per cent supporting the statement that speech programs should be in separate departments. Specifically, Central States reported 57 per cent (26) yes, Eastern States, 80 per cent (28) yes, Southern States, 52 per cent (13) yes, and Western States, 65 per cent (37) yes.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges or among the four regions in responses to the statement regarding separate departments for speech programs.

The majority of respondents believed the speech program should be in a separate department. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a higher percentage holding this opinion than colleges with 2,000-4,999 students. This difference of opinion suggests that most colleges believe their current departmental organization is appropriate for their needs; the number of colleges reporting departments specifically for the speech program (Table 3, p. 30) parallels the number of colleges supporting the statement that speech programs should be in separate departments.

The regional distribution of the responses to the same question, however, shows that Eastern States, where the lowest percentage of colleges reported departments specifically for the speech program (Table 3, p. 31), expressed the highest percentage of respondents supporting the statement. The data suggest many community colleges in the Eastern States do not provide separate departments for speech

programs, while the respondents expressed support for separate department status for these programs.

Title of Chairman of the Speech Program

The data reported in Table 7 show responses to the question, "Is your official title 'Department Chairman'?" Forty-eight per cent (83) of the respondents answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 41 per cent (42) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 59 per cent (41) yes.

Regional distribution of responses to this question showed Southern States used the title in 42 per cent (11) of the colleges, and the other three regions used it in 49 per cent of the colleges.

There was a significant difference in the use of the title Department Chairman between the two size groups of colleges. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a significantly higher percentage of use of the official title. There was no significant difference on the same question among the four regions.

The use of the title Department Chairman occurs in approximately one-half of the speech programs included in this survey. Table 3, p. 30, reported approximately one-half of the colleges had separate departments for the speech program. Thus it appears likely that most colleges with a department for the speech program also use the title of chairman.

Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a higher percentage of use of the title Department Chairman than the colleges with

TABLE 7

TITLE OF CHAIRMAN OF THE SPEECH PROGRAM

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Is official title "Department Chairman"						
Yes	42	40.8	41	58.6	83	48.0
No	61	59.2	29	41.4	90	52.0
Total	103	100.0	70	100.0	173	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 7 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is official title "Department Chairman"										
Yes	23	48.9	18	48.6	11	42.3	31	49.2	83	48.0
No	24	51.1	19	51.4	15	57.7	32	50.8	90	52.0
Total	47	100.0	37	100.0	26	100.0	63	100.0	173	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2,000-4,999 students. As the colleges increase in size, the probability increases that the administrative head of the speech program holds the official title of Department Chairman.

Reduced Teaching Load for Department Chairman

Table 8 reports responses to the question, "Is the chairman given a reduced teaching load?" Sixty-nine per cent (114) of the respondents answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 67 per cent (65) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 72 per cent (49) yes. Regional distribution of responses to this question showed a range of 61 to 79 per cent of the colleges reported the chairman had a reduced teaching load.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups, or among the four regions, on the number of colleges reporting a reduction in teaching load for department chairmen. The majority of colleges in both size groups and in the four regions granted a reduced teaching load to the department chairman. This reduction indicated recognition of the need for time to administer speech programs in community colleges.

Percentage of Teaching Load for Chairman

The data reported in Table 9 indicate responses to the question, "What percentage of a full load does the department chairman normally teach?" (Possible answers were 0, 20, 40, 60, 80, or 100 per cent.) Responses indicated the most common percentage taught by chairmen was 80 per cent of a normal load, with 31 per cent (46) reporting that

TABLE 8

REDUCED TEACHING LOAD FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Is chairman given a reduced teaching load						
Yes	65	67.0	49	72.1	114	69.1
No	32	33.0	19	27.9	51	30.9
Total	97	100.0	68	100.0	165	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 8 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is chairman given a reduced teaching load										
Yes	29	67.4	28	77.8	19	79.2	38	61.3	114	69.1
No	14	32.6	8	22.2	5	20.8	24	38.7	51	30.9
Total	43	100.0	36	100.0	24	100.0	62	100.0	165	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHING LOAD FOR CHAIRMAN

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
Percentage of full load:	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
0%	2	2.3	5	8.1	7	4.7
20%	14	15.9	5	8.1	19	12.7
40%	4	4.6	6	9.7	10	6.8
60%	19	21.6	9	14.6	28	18.6
80%	22	25.0	24	38.7	46	30.6
100%	27	30.6	13	20.8	40	26.6
Total	88	100.0	62	100.0	150	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 9 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Percentage of full load										
0%	3	7.5	1	3.6	0	0.0	3	5.2	7	4.7
20%	7	17.5	3	10.7	3	12.5	6	10.3	19	12.7
40%	2	5.0	3	10.7	1	4.1	4	6.9	10	6.8
60%	7	17.5	4	14.3	7	29.2	10	17.2	28	18.6
80%	11	27.5	11	39.3	6	25.0	18	31.0	46	30.6
100%	10	25.0	6	21.4	7	29.2	17	29.4	40	26.6
Total	40	100.0	28	100.0	24	100.0	58	100.0	150	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

figure. Other responses showed 27 per cent (40) of the chairman taught 100 per cent of a normal load, and 19 per cent (28) taught 60 per cent of a normal load.

Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 31 per cent (27) of the chairmen carrying 100 per cent of a normal load, and 25 per cent (22) carrying 80 per cent. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 39 per cent (24) of the chairmen taught 80 per cent of a normal load, and 21 per cent (13) taught 100 per cent of a normal load.

Regional distribution followed the same basic pattern reflected in the two size groups, with all four regions reporting 25 to 39 per cent in the category of chairmen teaching 80 per cent of a normal load, and 21 to 29 per cent teaching 100 per cent.

The chi-square test was applied to the responses to this question by combining the categories of 0, 20, and 40 per cent into a single unit. There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions, on the percentage of full teaching load carried by department chairmen.

The most frequent percentage reported by respondents was 80 per cent of a normal load for the department chairman. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a higher percentage of chairmen in this category than colleges with 2,000-4,999 students, whereas in the second most frequent category, 100 per cent of a normal load, the colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported a higher percentage of chairmen than the 5,000 or more group. The reduction of teaching load for the

department chairman tends to occur more often as the colleges increase in size to the 5,000 or more level. This pattern can be attributed to increased demands on the chairman's time in the larger colleges.

Chairman's Responsibilities: Budgeting, Scheduling, Recruiting

The data reported in Table 10 show the responses to questions on the department chairman's responsibilities in budgeting, scheduling classes, and recruiting faculty. In response to the question, "Does the chairman plan and administer the budget for his area," 84 per cent (138) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 75 per cent (72) yes, and colleges with more than 5,000 students answered 96 per cent (66) yes. Responses from the four regions to this question showed a range of 71 to 90 per cent of the chairmen planned and administered budgets.

There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the department chairman's responsibility for the budget. A significantly higher percentage of colleges with 5,000 or more students indicated responsibility in this area. On the same question, there was no significant difference among the four regions.

In response to the question, "Does the chairman schedule classes for faculty in his area," 86 per cent (142) of all reporting colleges answered yes (Table 10, p. 53). Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 82 per cent (78) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 91 per cent (64) yes. Regional responses showed a range of 79 to 95 per cent of the chairmen were responsible for class schedules.

TABLE 10

CHAIRMAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES: BUDGETING, SCHEDULING, RECRUITING

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Plan and administer budget						
Yes	72	75.0	66	95.7	138	83.6
No	24	25.0	3	4.3	27	16.4
Total	96	100.0	69	100.0	165	100.0
Schedule classes						
Yes	78	82.1	64	91.4	142	86.1
No	17	17.9	6	8.6	23	13.9
Total	95	100.0	70	100.0	165	100.0
Recruit new faculty						
Yes	86	92.5	61	88.4	147	90.7
No	7	7.5	8	11.6	15	9.3
Total	93	100.0	69	100.0	162	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 10 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Plan and administer budget										
Yes	36	81.1	25	71.4	21	87.5	56	90.3	138	83.6
No	8	18.2	10	28.6	3	12.5	6	9.7	27	16.4
Total	44	100.0	35	100.0	24	100.0	62	100.0	165	100.0
Schedule classes										
Yes	38	84.4	26	76.5	19	79.2	59	95.2	142	86.1
No	7	15.6	8	23.5	5	20.8	3	4.8	23	13.9
Total	45	100.0	34	100.0	24	100.0	62	100.0	165	100.0
Recruit new faculty										
Yes	39	90.7	30	88.2	21	91.3	57	91.9	147	90.7
No	4	9.3	4	11.8	2	8.7	5	8.1	15	9.3
Total	43	100.0	34	100.0	23	100.0	62	100.0	162	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the question of the chairman's responsibility for scheduling classes.

The third question on the chairman's responsibilities was, "When staff openings occur in the speech program, does the chairman evaluate and recommend candidates for the positions?" In response to this question, 91 per cent (147) of all reporting colleges replied yes (Table 10, p. 53). Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 93 per cent (86) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 88 per cent (61) yes. Regional distribution of responses to this question showed all four regions reporting a range of 88 to 92 per cent of colleges with chairmen responsible to evaluate and recommend new faculty.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the question of the chairman's responsibility to evaluate and recommend new faculty.

The chairman of the speech program usually has responsibilities in budgeting, scheduling classes, and recruiting new faculty. The 5,000 or more group of colleges reported a higher percentage of chairmen with responsibility for the budget, which indicates the chairman's responsibility in this area increases as the college becomes larger.

Chairman's Responsibilities: Evaluation of Staff

Table 11 reports responses to the question, "Does the chairman evaluate and recommend instructors for promotion and salary increase?" Sixty per cent (97) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges

TABLE 11

CHAIRMAN'S RESPONSIBILITIES: EVALUATION OF STAFF

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Chairman recommends staff for promotion						
Yes	55	59.8	42	60.9	97	60.2
No	37	40.2	27	39.1	64	39.8
Total	92	100.0	69	100.0	161	100.0
Staff assists chairman in evaluation						
Yes	48	82.8	29	74.4	77	79.4
No	10	17.2	10	25.6	20	20.6
Total	58	100.0	39	100.0	97	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 11 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Chairman recommends staff for promotion										
Yes	29	69.0	29	85.3	14	58.3	25	41.0	97	60.2
No	13	31.0	5	14.7	10	41.7	36	59.0	64	39.8
Total	42	100.0	34	100.0	24	100.0	61	100.0	161	100.0
Staff assists chairman in evaluation										
Yes	22	78.6	22	73.3	11	73.3	22	91.7	77	79.4
No	6	21.4	8	26.7	4	26.7	2	8.3	20	20.6
Total	28	100.0	30	100.0	15	100.0	24	100.0	97	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

with 2,000-4,999 students answered 60 per cent (55) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 61 per cent (42) yes.

Regional distribution to the question of the chairman's responsibility to evaluate and recommend staff for promotion and salary increase showed a wide range of responses. The affirmative responses for the regions were: Central States, 69 per cent (29); Eastern States, 85 per cent (29); Southern States, 58 per cent (14); and Western States, 41 per cent (25).

There was no significant difference in the two size groups of colleges on the question of the chairman's responsibility to evaluate and recommend staff for promotion and salary increase. There was a significant difference among regional responses to this question. Eastern and Central States reported significantly higher percentages of colleges in which the chairman had responsibility to evaluate and recommend staff for promotion and salary increase.

A related question asked if staff assisted the department chairman in the evaluation of staff. Sixty per cent (97) of the reporting colleges responded affirmatively. Of colleges with 2,000-4,999 students, 60 per cent (55) reported yes to the question, and of colleges with 5,000 or more students, 61 per cent (42) reported yes. Regional distribution of responses to this question showed the four regions reporting a range of 73 to 92 per cent of colleges with staff assisting in the evaluation process.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question. Among the regions, Western States

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reported 92 per cent (22) of colleges with staff assistance in evaluation, while the other three regions reported a range of 73 to 78 per cent.

The data indicate most chairmen are responsible for evaluation of staff. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported a higher percentage of staff assistance in this evaluation than the colleges in the 5,000 or more group. This difference might reflect greater involvement from faculty members in smaller departments, and also the tendency to have more formalized structure and responsibilities in the larger group of colleges.

Staff: Normal Teaching Load

The data reported in Table 12 indicate the normal teaching load for faculty in the speech program. Seventy-nine per cent (136) of the reporting colleges stated the normal teaching load was 15 hours, and 16 per cent (28) reported 12 hours. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 74 per cent (75) with 15 hours, and 19 per cent (19) with 12 hours. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 86 per cent (61) with 15 hours, and 13 per cent (9) with 12 hours. Regional distribution of responses to this question showed all four regions reporting a range of 63 to 89 per cent of colleges with a 15 hour normal teaching load, and 5 to 31 per cent of the colleges with a 12 hour load.

The chi-square test was applied to the data reported in Table 12 by combining the categories of 9 and 12 hours into a single unit, and deleting the categories of 18 and other. There was no significant

TABLE 12

STAFF: NORMAL TEACHING LOAD

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Instructional hours per week:						
9	2	1.9	0	0.0	2	1.2
12	19	18.6	9	12.7	28	16.2
15	75	73.6	61	85.9	136	78.6
18	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
other	6	5.9	1	1.4	7	4.0
Total	102	100.0	71	100.0	173	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 12 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Instructional hours per week:										
9	0	0.0	2	5.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.2
12	11	22.9	11	31.4	3	11.5	3	4.7	28	16.2
15	34	70.8	22	62.9	23	88.5	57	89.1	136	78.6
18	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
other	3	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	6.2	7	4.0
Total	48	100.0	35	100.0	26	100.0	64	100.0	173	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question, but there was a significant difference among the four regions. Central and Eastern States reported significantly higher percentages of 12 hour loads, and Southern and Western States reported significantly higher percentages of 15 hour loads.

Most speech program staff in community colleges apparently carry a 15 hour work load. Colleges with 5,000 or more students showed a greater tendency to have a 15 hour work load than colleges with 2,000-4,999, but in both size groups of colleges, the normal load was 15 hours. Southern and Western States also showed a greater tendency to have a 15 hour load than Central and Eastern States, but the overall normal load was 15 hours in all regions.

Compensation for Out-of-Class Responsibilities

Table 13 reports the responses to the question, "Are instructors in the speech program compensated for major and out-of-class assignments such as directing a play or coaching a debate team?" Sixty-eight per cent (115) of the reporting colleges indicated staff were compensated. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 60 per cent (59) were compensated, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 80 per cent (56) were compensated, and 20 per cent (14) were not.

Regional distribution of responses to this question showed the four regions reporting a range of 57 to 80 per cent of colleges with compensation for out-of-class responsibilities.

TABLE 13

COMPENSATION FOR OUT-OF-CLASS RESPONSIBILITIES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Is compensation provided for out-of-class responsibilities						
Yes	59	59.6	56	80.0	115	68.0
No	40	40.4	14	20.0	54	32.0
Total	99	100.0	70	100.0	169	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 13 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is compensation provided for out-of-class responsibilities										
Yes	37	80.4	22	64.7	20	76.9	36	57.1	115	68.0
No	9	19.6	12	35.3	6	23.1	27	42.9	54	32.0
Total	46	100.0	34	100.0	26	100.0	63	100.0	169	100.0

There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a significantly higher percentage of colleges providing compensation. There was also a significant difference among the four regions on this question. Central and Southern States reported significantly higher percentages of colleges providing compensation for out-of-class responsibilities than Eastern and Western States.

Most speech program staff in the responding community colleges received compensation for out-of-class responsibilities. The 5,000 or more group of colleges reported a higher percentage of colleges providing compensation, which could reflect increased recognition of out-of-class responsibilities in the larger colleges. Central and Southern States also reported higher percentages of colleges providing compensation for out-of-class responsibilities for speech program staff, which could also show increased recognition of the importance of these responsibilities in community colleges in those regions.

Method of Compensation for Out-of-Class Responsibilities

The data reported in Table 14 show the method of compensation provided for out-of-class responsibilities. Respondents replied in three categories: reduction in teaching load, additional income, or other. Sixty-four per cent (89) of the reporting colleges indicated a reduction in teaching load, and 32 per cent (44) reported additional income. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 62 per cent (46) with reduction in teaching load, and 34 per cent (25) with additional

TABLE 14

METHOD OF COMPENSATION FOR OUT-OF-CLASS RESPONSIBILITIES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Method of compensation:						
reduction in teaching load	46	62.2	43	66.2	89	64.0
additional income	25	33.8	19	29.2	44	31.7
other	3	4.0	3	4.6	6	4.3
Total	74	100.0	65	100.0	139	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 14 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Method of compensation:										
reduction in teaching load	31	64.6	19	76.0	16	80.0	23	50.0	89	64.0
additional income	14	29.2	6	24.0	3	15.0	21	45.7	44	31.7
other	3	6.2	0	0.0	1	5.0	2	4.3	6	4.3
Total	48	100.0	25	100.0	20	100.0	46	100.0	139	100.0

income. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 66 per cent (43) with reduction in teaching load, and 29 per cent (19) with additional income.

Regional distribution of responses to this question showed the four regions reporting a range of 50 to 80 per cent of colleges that used a reduction in teaching load as the method of compensation for out-of-class responsibilities, and 15 to 46 per cent that used additional income.

The chi-square test was applied to the data on this question by deleting the category of other. There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question, but there was a significant difference among the four regions. Western States reported a significantly lower percentage of reduction in teaching load, and a significantly higher percentage of additional income, as methods of compensation for out-of-class responsibilities.

The most frequent method of compensation for out-of-class responsibilities was reduction in teaching load. This method of compensation implies that most of the reporting colleges considered out-of-class responsibilities to be an integral part of the work load. Western States did not use reduction in teaching load to the extent the other regions did, but Western States did use this method more than additional income. The lower percentage of use of reduction in teaching load reported by Western States' colleges suggests that out-of-class responsibilities in these colleges were not considered part of the normal load.

Professional Training of Staff

Table 15 reports the data on the educational background of the speech program staff. Respondents were asked to state the number of full time staff in each of seven categories: B.A., M.A., M.A.T., M.A. plus 30 graduate hours, Ed.D., Ph.D., and other. Forty-seven per cent (330) of the staff members reported by their chairmen held the Master's as their highest degree. An additional 34 per cent (237) held the M.A. plus 30 graduate hours, and 10 per cent (72) held the Ph.D.

Both size groups of colleges reported large percentages in the M.A. and M.A. plus 30 categories. Specifically, colleges with 2,000 to 4,999 students reported 49 per cent (144) with M.A., and 35 per cent (102) with M.A. plus 30. The corresponding figures for colleges with 5,000 or more students were 45 per cent (186) with M.A., and 33 per cent (135) with M.A. plus 30. Regional distribution of responses to this question showed all four regions reporting 46 to 49 per cent in the category of M.A., and 31 to 39 per cent in the category of M.A. plus 30.

There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the question of educational backgrounds of staff. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a significantly higher percentage of staff holding the Ph.D.

Nearly all speech program staff in reporting colleges held at least a Master's degree. A large number, approximately one-third, had also completed 30 hours of graduate work beyond the Master's degree. Staff members who continued studies on the doctoral level clearly preferred the Ph.D. to the Ed.D.

TABLE 15

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF STAFF

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Highest degree completed:						
BA	5	1.7	6	1.4	11	1.6
MA	144	49.3	186	45.2	330	46.9
MAT	14	4.8	9	2.2	23	3.3
MA+30	102	34.9	135	32.8	237	33.7
EdD	5	1.7	6	1.4	11	1.5
PhD	19	6.5	53	12.9	72	10.2
Other	3	1.0	16	3.1	19	2.8
Total	292*	100.0	411*	100.0	703*	100.0

*These figures refer to full-time staff only.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 15 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Highest degree completed:										
BA	2	1.0	4	2.4	0	0.0	5	2.0	11	1.5
MA	99	49.0	77	45.5	37	46.2	117	46.4	330	46.9
MAT	11	5.4	1	.6	3	3.7	8	3.2	23	3.3
MA+30	65	32.2	53	31.4	31	38.8	88	35.0	237	33.7
EdD	1	.5	6	3.6	1	1.3	3	1.2	11	1.5
PhD	24	11.9	26	15.3	8	10.0	14	5.6	72	10.2
Other	0	0.0	2	1.2	0	0.0	17	6.6	19	2.8
Total	202*	100.0	169*	100.0	80*	100.0	252*	100.0	703*	100.0

*These figures refer to full-time staff only.

Perhaps the previous committment to the field of speech explains the great difference between the number of staff who held the Ph.D. compared with the Ed.D. Most community colleges require the Master's degree in the subject area to be taught, rather than in the field of education, as the minimum requirement for a staff position. A staff member who has completed a Master's degree, or a Master's plus 30 graduate hours in the field of speech, would be more likely to work for a Ph.D. in the same area than to shift emphasis to the field of education.

The explanation for the higher percentage of Ph.D. degrees in the group of colleges with 5,000 or more students could be that larger speech programs and larger community colleges attract more applicants for positions, and thus allow a more competitive selection of staff.

Full and Part Time Staff

The data in Table 16 show the total numbers of full and part time staff reported by the respondents for each of the two size groups, and for each of the four regions. Sixty-nine per cent (703) of the speech program staff were full time, and 31 per cent (312) were part time. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 65 per cent (292) full time staff, and 35 per cent (159) part time. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 73 per cent (411) full time, and 27 per cent (153) part time. Regional distribution of full time and part time staff showed the four regions reporting a range of 66 to 74 per cent full time staff, and 26 to 34 per cent part time staff.

TABLE 16

FULL AND PART TIME STAFF

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total full time staff in all reporting colleges	292	64.7	411	72.9	703	69.3
Total part time staff in all reporting colleges	159	35.3	153	27.1	312	30.7
Total	451	100.0	564	100.0	1015*	100.0

*This number is based on head count. If teaching load were included, the number of credit hours taught by full time staff would exceed the part time by a greater ratio.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 16 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total full time staff in all reporting colleges	202	65.8	169	73.5	80	70.2	252	69.2	703	69.3
Total part time staff in all reporting colleges	105	34.2	61	26.5	34	29.8	112	30.8	312	30.7
Total	307	100.0	230	100.0	114	100.0	364	100.0	1015*	100.0

*This number is based on head count. If teaching load were included, the number of credit hours taught by full time staff would exceed the part time by a greater ratio.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the number of full time and part time staff. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a significantly higher percentage of full time staff than colleges with 2,000-4,999 students. Conversely, colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported a higher percentage of part time staff. There was no significant difference among the regions on the same question.

Most community colleges have full time staff for speech programs that greatly exceed the number of part time staff. Apparently, part time instructors teach a comparatively small number of classes. The higher percentage of part time staff in colleges with 2,000-4,999 students might be attributed to smaller departments for the speech program. As the colleges increased in size to 5,000 or more, the larger departments more adequately met their instructional needs with full time staff.

Staff Enrolled in Graduate Programs

Table 17 reports the responses to the question, "How many instructors in the speech program are currently enrolled in a graduate program?" Thirty-one per cent (219) of the staff members reported by the respondents were enrolled in graduate programs. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 29 per cent (84), and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 33 per cent (135) were enrolled in graduate programs. Regional distribution of responses to this question showed

TABLE 17

STAFF ENROLLED IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Staff enrolled in graduate programs	84	28.8	135	32.8	219	31.2
Staff not enrolled in graduate programs	208	71.2	276	67.2	484	68.8
Total	292	100.0	411	100.0	703	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 17 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Staff enrolled in graduate programs	82	40.6	71	42.0	18	22.5	48	19.0	219	31.2
Staff not enrolled in graduate programs	120	59.4	98	58.0	62	77.5	204	81.0	484	68.8
Total	202	100.0	169	100.0	80	100.0	252	100.0	703	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Central States with 41 per cent (82) enrolled, and Eastern States with 42 per cent (71) enrolled. Southern States reported 23 per cent (18) enrolled, and Western States reported 19 per cent (48) enrolled.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the question of how many staff were enrolled in graduate schools. There was a significant difference among the regions on this question. Central and Eastern States reported percentages approximately double the Southern and Western States for staff members currently enrolled in graduate programs. Perhaps the graduate programs in the Central and Eastern States are more accessible to the community college staff in these regions.

Approximately one-third of the speech program staff members reported by their chairmen were enrolled in graduate courses. Since most staff members in these programs already held the minimum professional requirement, the Master's degree (Table 15, p. 70), it is apparent many staff members were interested in professional training beyond the mimimum level. Although the percentage of staff enrolled in graduate programs was approximately equal in both size groups of colleges, a rather sharp difference was noted among the regions. Central and Eastern States, which also showed a higher percentage of 12 hour teaching loads (Table 12, p. 60), reported higher percentages of staff enrolled in graduate programs. The data suggest many speech program staff use the time available as a result of lighter teaching loads to improve their professional qualifications.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Staff Enrolled in Ph.D. Programs and Other Graduate Programs

The data reported in Table 18 show the number of staff members enrolled in Ph.D. programs and in other graduate programs. Of the total number of staff members currently enrolled in graduate programs, 77 per cent (169) were in Ph.D. programs, and 23 per cent (50) were enrolled in other graduate programs, including Ed.D., M.A., and M.A.T. programs. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 73 per cent (61) in Ph.D. programs, and 27 per cent (23) in other graduate programs. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 80 per cent (108) in Ph.D. programs, and 20 per cent (27) in other graduate programs. Regional distribution of staff members currently enrolled in graduate programs showed the four regions reporting a range of 75 to 83 per cent in Ph.D. programs, and 17 to 25 per cent in other graduate programs.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions, on the number of staff enrolled in Ph.D. programs and other graduate programs.

The apparent preference for Ph.D. programs was expressed in the data on professional training of staff (Table 15, p. 70). This preference is reinforced by the high percentage of staff members in graduate programs who are working toward the Ph.D. Although the community college does not normally apply the pressure that four year institutions frequently do, many of the community college speech staff enrolled in graduate programs are working toward a Ph.D.

TABLE 18

STAFF ENROLLED IN PH.D. PROGRAMS AND OTHER GRADUATE PROGRAMS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Staff enrolled in Ph.D. programs	61	72.6	108	80.0	169	77.2
Staff enrolled in other graduate programs	23	27.4	27	20.0	50	22.8
Total	84	100.0	135	100.0	219	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 18 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Staff enrolled in Ph.D. programs	65	79.3	53	74.6	15	83.3	36	75.0	169	77.2
Staff enrolled in other graduate programs	17	20.7	18	25.4	3	16.7	12	25.0	50	22.8
Total	82	100.0	71	100.0	18	100.0	48	100.0	219	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Full Time Staff Teaching the Basic Speech Courses

Table 19 reports the responses to the question, "Of the total number of instructors in the speech program, how many full time instructors teach the basic speech course?" Chairmen reported 89 per cent (624) of staff members taught the basic course. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 97 per cent (282), and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 83 per cent (341) of staff members taught the basic course. Regional responses to this question indicated all four regions within a range of 84 to 95 per cent of staff members who taught the basic course.

There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the number of full time staff teaching the basic speech course. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported a significantly higher percentage of staff teaching the basic speech course than colleges with 5,000 or more students. The colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group have smaller departments and thus must deploy staff in a more general manner, which apparently includes the basic speech course for all but a very few instructors. There was no significant difference among the four regions on the same question.

Although both size groups and all four regions reported consistently high percentages of full time staff members who taught the basic speech course, colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a lower percentage than the smaller colleges. Apparently as the colleges increase in size to 5,000 or more, there is a slight increase in the

TABLE 19

FULL TIME STAFF TEACHING THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Total full time staff teaching the basic speech course in all reporting colleges	283	96.9	341	83.0	624	88.8
Total full time staff not teaching the basic speech course in all reporting colleges	9	3.1	70	17.0	79	11.2
Total	292	100.0	411	100.0	703	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 19 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Total full time staff teaching the basic speech course in all reporting colleges	182	90.1	142	84.0	76	95.0	224	88.9	624	88.8
Total full time staff not teaching the basic speech course in all reporting colleges	20	9.9	27	16.0	4	5.0	28	11.1	79	11.2
Total	202	100.0	169	100.0	80	100.0	252	100.0	703	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

percentage of staff who are not teaching the basic speech course. This increase suggests a slight tendency to specialize in other areas, such as drama, in these colleges.

Membership in Professional Associations

The data reported in Table 20 give a breakdown of the number of memberships in professional associations held by speech program staff. Of the total memberships reported (1165), chairmen reported 24 per cent (281) were in the Speech Communication Association; 32 per cent (257) were in state speech associations; and 17 per cent (199) were in regional associations. The percentages reported by the two size groups of colleges were approximately the same as those in the overall total. Other memberships, including the American Theatre Association, Phi Rho Pi, and AAUP, accounted for 36 per cent (428) of the total.

Regional distribution of memberships in professional associations also showed percentages similar to those in the overall total, with a few exceptions. Memberships in the regional speech association in the Southern States represented a lower percentage of the total than in the other regions. Eastern States reported a higher percentage of its total memberships in the American Theatre Association, and Eastern States also reported a lower percentage of memberships in Phi Rho Pi than the other regions.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges in the distribution of memberships in professional associations. There was a significant difference among the regions in response

TABLE 20

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Speech Communication Association	146	24.3	135	23.9	281	24.1
American Theatre Association	75	12.5	59	10.4	134	10.5
Regional Speech Association	105	17.5	94	16.6	199	17.1
State Speech Association	129	21.5	128	22.7	257	22.1
Phi Rho Pi	38	6.3	62	11.0	100	8.6
AAUP	62	10.3	58	10.3	120	10.3
Other	45	7.6	29	5.1	74	6.3
Total	600	100.0	565	100.0	1165	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 20 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	
Speech Communication Association	101	25.2	41	23.7	38	20.4	101	24.9	281	24.1
American Theatre Association	50	12.5	32	18.5	19	10.2	43	10.6	144	12.4
Regional Speech Association	70	17.5	27	15.6	19	10.2	73	18.0	189	16.2
State Speech Association	97	24.2	39	22.5	46	24.7	75	18.5	257	22.1
Phi Rho Pi	24	6.0	3	1.7	27	14.5	46	11.4	100	8.6
AAUP	40	10.0	21	12.2	22	11.8	37	9.2	120	10.3
Other	19	4.6	10	5.8	15	8.1	30	7.4	74	6.3
Total	401	100.0	173	100.0	186	100.0	405	100.0	1165	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to this question. Southern and Western States reported significantly higher percentages of memberships in Phi Rho Pi, and Eastern States reported a significantly higher percentage of memberships in the American Theatre Association.

The Speech Communication Association and state speech associations showed the greatest strength within the total number of memberships reported. Perhaps the Speech Communication Association, because of its recognition and prestige, and the state speech associations because of their easy availability, explain this distribution of memberships.

Membership in the Speech Communication Association

The data reported in Table 21 present a comparison of staff memberships in the Speech Communication Association with the total number of speech program staff reported by chairmen. Forty per cent (281) of all staff reported by chairmen held membership in SCA. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 50 per cent (146) were members of SCA, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 33 per cent (135) were members.

Regional distribution of responses to this question showed Central, Southern, and Western States reporting a range of 40 to 50 per cent of staff with memberships in SCA, while Eastern States reported only 24 per cent.

There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on memberships in the Speech Communication Association.

TABLE 21

MEMBERSHIP IN SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
SCA members	146	50.0	135	32.8	281	40.0
Other staff (non-members of SCA)	146	50.0	276	67.2	422	60.0
Total	292	100.0	411	100.0	703	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 21 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
SCA members	101	50.0	41	24.3	38	47.5	101	40.1	281	40.0
Other staff (non-members of SCA)	101	50.0	128	75.7	42	52.5	151	59.9	422	60.0
Total	202	100.0	169	100.0	80	100.0	252	100.0	703	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported a significantly higher percentage of staff who held SCA membership than the colleges with 5,000 or more students. There was also a significant difference among the regions on this question. Central States reported the highest percentage of SCA memberships, followed by Southern, Western, and Eastern States.

The data suggest that as the colleges increased in size, a lower percentage of staff held membership in SCA. It is noteworthy that in the colleges with 5,000 or more students, the number of memberships in SCA coincided with the number enrolled in graduate programs (Table 17, p. 76). Conversely, colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported a lower percentage of staff enrolled in graduate programs (Table 17, p. 76) and a higher percentage of staff with membership in SCA, than the larger colleges.

Among the regions, Eastern States reported a lower percentage of memberships in SCA. Eastern States also reported fewer departments for the speech program (Table 3, p. 30), and more departments under the title of English Department (Table 4, p. 33), than the other regions. The status and title of the department for the speech program, which were weaker in Eastern States than other regions, seem to affect the percentage of memberships in SCA.

Expected Staff Increases

Table 22 reports responses to the questions, "How many full time staff members do you expect to add to your speech program within the next year?" and "Within the next five years?" Chairmen reported twenty per cent (64) of the faculty to be added were scheduled for 1972-73, and 80 per cent (251) during the next five years. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 23 per cent (41) of the faculty to be added were expected in 1972-73, and 77 per cent (134) within five years. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 16 per cent (23) of their expected increase in 1972-73, and 84 per cent (117) within five years. Regional distribution of responses to this question showed all four regions reporting 15 to 28 per cent of their five year total of additional staff expected within the next year, and 72 to 85 per cent expected within the next five years.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions, in responses to this question.

The growth in the community college speech program staff is expected to be gradual for the next five years. Considering the changing enrollment patterns in U.S. higher education, this expectation is probably realistic. Both size groups, and all four regions, reported similar expected growth rates.

TABLE 22

EXPECTED STAFF INCREASES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
No. of faculty to be added 1972-73	41	23.4	23	16.4	64	20.3
No. of faculty to be added within five years	134	76.6	117	83.6	251	79.7
Total	175	100.0	140	100.0	315	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 22 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No. of faculty to be added 1972-73	19	25.0	15	17.4	15	28.3	15	15.0	64	20.3
No. of faculty to be added within five years	57	75.0	71	82.6	38	71.7	85	85.0	251	79.7
Total	76	100.0	86	100.0	53	100.0	100	100.0	315	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Graduate Programs for Community College Teachers

Table 23 reports responses to the question, "In your opinion, should graduate schools develop programs that give special emphasis to prepare teachers who will work in speech programs in community colleges?" Sixty-two per cent (104) of the reporting colleges replied yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 63 per cent (63) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 59 per cent (41) yes. Regional distribution of responses to this question showed two regions, Central and Western States, reporting 64 and 71 per cent yes, and the other two regions, Eastern and Southern States, reporting 51 and 50 per cent yes.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions, in response to this question. Most of the respondents expressed a positive attitude toward the development of graduate programs for community college speech teachers. This attitude could be interpreted as recognition of a need that is not currently being met by graduate colleges. The traditional, research-oriented graduate program does not provide primary emphasis on teaching skills, and it is precisely these teaching skills that are needed by the community college instructor. Western States, where community colleges have the longest history, reported a higher percentage of respondents with the opinion that graduate schools should develop such programs.

TABLE 23

GRADUATE PROGRAMS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE TEACHERS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Should graduate schools develop programs for community college speech teachers						
Yes	63	63.3	41	59.4	104	61.9
No	36	36.7	28	40.6	64	38.1
Total	99	100.0	69	100.0	168	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 23 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Should graduate schools develop programs for community college speech teachers										
Yes	30	63.8	18	51.4	12	50.0	44	71.0	104	61.9
No	17	36.2	17	48.6	12	50.0	18	29.0	64	38.1
Total	47	100.0	35	100.0	24	100.0	62	100.0	168	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Number of Sections of the Basic Speech Course

The data reported in Table 24 present the total number of sections, and the average number of sections per college, of the basic speech course per semester. The total number of sections reported for all colleges was 2,181 per semester. Of this number, 49 per cent (1,075) of the sections were offered in colleges of 2,000-4,999 students, and 51 per cent (1106) were offered in colleges of 5,000 or more students.

Regional distribution of the total number of sections of the basic speech course per semester was: Central States, 37 per cent (802) of the total; Eastern States, 18 per cent (399) of the total; Southern States, 11 per cent (249) of the total; and Western States, 34 per cent (731) of the total.

Table 24 also reports data on the average number of sections per college per semester. The overall average was 12.4 sections. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 10.3 sections per college, and colleges with more than 5,000 students reported 15.5 sections. Regional averages for the number of sections were: Central States, 16.7; Eastern States, 11.0; Southern States, 9.5; and Western States, 11.2.

The chi-square test was applied to the average number of sections of the basic speech course per college. There was no significant difference in the distribution of average number of sections within the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions.

TABLE 24

NUMBER OF SECTIONS OF BASIC SPEECH COURSE PER SEMESTER

REGIONS	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	No. of sections for all colleges	%	No. of sections for all colleges	%	No. of sections for all colleges	%
Central States	479	44.6	323	29.2	802	36.8
Eastern States	296	27.5	103	9.3	399	18.3
Southern States	121	11.3	128	11.6	249	11.4
Western States	179	16.6	552	49.9	731	33.5
Total	1075	100.0	1106	100.0	2181	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 24 (continued)

REGIONS	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS			COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS			TOTAL		
	Sections of Basic Course	No. of Colleges	Average No. of Sections	Sections of Basic Course	No. of Colleges	Average No. of Sections	Sections of Basic Course	No. of Colleges	Average No. of Sections
Central States	479	31	15.4	323	17	19.0	802	48	16.7 (34.4)
Eastern States	296	26	11.3	103	10	10.3	399	36	11.0 (21.6)
Southern States	121	17	7.1	128	9	14.2	249	26	9.5 (21.3)
Western States	179	30	5.9	552	35	15.7	731	65	11.2 (21.6)
Total	1075	104	10.3 (39.7)	1106	71	15.5 (59.2)	2181	175	12.4 (98.9)

(Marginal figures in parentheses were used to compute the chi-square. These figures represent the totals of the figures in the columns Average No. of Sections. They are not percentages.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The number of sections of the basic speech course reported for the two size groups of colleges was approximately equal. Colleges with 5,000 or more students, however, offered an average of 10.5 sections per college compared with 10.3 sections in the 2,000-4,999 group of colleges. Thus, as the colleges increased in size, they expanded the number of sections of the basic speech course to accomodate the increased enrollment. Eastern States reported an exception to this trend: colleges with 2,000-4,999 students averaged 11.3 sections, and colleges with 5,000 or more students averaged 10.3 sections. Although the reason for the exception in Eastern States is uncertain, it might be related to the relatively weak status of the speech programs in that region (Table 3, p. 30 and Table 4, p. 33).

Average Class Size in the Basic Speech Course

The data reported in Table 25 present average class sizes of the basic speech course. Fifty-one per cent (71) of all reporting colleges indicated a class size of 25-29; and 40 per cent (70) reported a class size of 20-24. Both size groups of colleges reported large percentages of class sizes in the 20-24 and 25-29 categories. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 44 per cent (46) with class sizes of 20-24, and 32 per cent (34) with class sizes of 25-29. The corresponding figures for colleges with 5,000 or more students were 34 per cent (24) with class sizes of 20-24, and 53 per cent (37) with class sizes of 25-29.

TABLE 25

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE IN BASIC SPEECH COURSE

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Class sizes:						
35-40	1	0.9	1	1.4	2	1.1
30-34	8	7.6	6	8.6	14	8.0
25-29	34	32.4	37	52.9	71	40.6
20-24	46	43.8	24	34.3	70	40.0
15-19	15	14.4	2	2.8	17	9.7
Other	1	0.9	0	0.0	1	0.6
Total	105	100.0	70	100.0	175	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 25 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Class sizes:										
35-40	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.5	2	1.1
30-34	2	4.1	3	8.6	1	3.8	8	12.3	14	8.0
25-29	17	34.7	11	31.4	13	50.0	30	46.2	71	40.6
20-24	24	49.0	16	45.7	9	34.6	21	32.3	70	40.0
15-19	4	8.2	5	14.3	3	11.6	5	7.7	17	9.7
Other	1	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.6
Total	49	100.0	35	100.0	26	100.0	65	100.0	175	100.0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The regional distribution of average class sizes showed Central and Eastern States with smaller classes than Southern and Western States. Specifically, Central States reported 49 per cent (24), and Eastern States 46 per cent (16) with a class size of 20-24, while Southern States reported 35 per cent (9), and Western States 32 per cent (21) with class sizes of 20-24.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on average class sizes of the basic speech course. Two average class sizes were reported with approximately equal frequency from all reporting colleges, 20-24, and 25-29. Colleges with 5,000 or more students, however, reported a higher percentage of average class sizes of 25-29 than of 20-24, while the reverse was true for colleges with 2,000-4,999 students. Apparently, as the colleges increased in size, they also increased the size of the basic speech course.

Emphasis of the Basic Speech Course

The data reported in Table 26 present the different areas of emphasis used in the basic speech course. (Possible responses were Communication, Public Speaking, Fundamentals, Multiple, and Other.) Thirty-seven per cent (84) of all reporting colleges indicated emphasis on Communication; 26 per cent (59) Public Speaking; 19 per cent (43) Fundamentals; 16 per cent (37) Multiple; and 3 per cent (7) reported other.

Both size groups of colleges reported their highest percentages in the area of Communication. Specifically, colleges with 2,000-4,999

TABLE 26

EMPHASIS OF THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Areas of emphasis:						
Communication	50	36.2	34	37.0	84	36.5
Public Speaking	34	24.6	25	27.2	59	25.7
Fundamentals	27	19.6	16	17.4	43	18.7
Multiple	23	16.7	14	15.2	37	16.1
Other	4	2.9	3	3.2	7	3.0
Total	138	100.0	92	100.0	230	100.0

TABLE 26 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Areas of emphasis:										
Communication	27	43.5	14	32.6	14	40.0	29	32.2	84	36.5
Public Speaking	8	12.9	17	39.5	9	25.7	25	27.8	59	25.7
Fundamentals	17	27.4	6	14.0	3	8.6	17	18.9	43	18.7
Multiple	8	12.9	5	11.6	9	25.7	15	16.7	37	16.1
Other	2	3.2	1	2.3	0	0.0	4	4.4	7	3.0
Total	62	100.0	43	100.0	35	100.0	90	100.0	230	100.0

students reported 36 per cent (50), and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 37 per cent (34) emphasized Communication. Among the four regions, only Eastern States reported a higher percentage emphasized an area other than Communication. Eastern States reported 40 per cent (17) emphasized Public Speaking, and 33 per cent (14) Communication.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question, but there was a significant difference among the regions. Central and Southern States reported higher percentages of emphasis on Communication, and Eastern States reported a higher percentage of emphasis on Public Speaking, than the other regions. Perhaps the traditional approach to higher education in many Eastern States can explain the dominant emphasis on Public Speaking in many community colleges in that area.

Departmental Syllabus for the Basic Speech Course

Table 27 reports responses to the question, "Does the basic speech course follow a departmental syllabus?" Fifty-seven per cent (97) of the reporting colleges replied yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 61 per cent (62) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 52 per cent (35) yes. Regional responses to this question showed Western States using a departmental syllabus for the basic speech course in 40 per cent (25) of the colleges, while the other three regions reported a range of 63 to 75 per cent of the colleges using a syllabus.

TABLE 27

DEPARTMENTAL SYLLABUS FOR THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Use of a departmental syllabus for the basic speech course						
Yes	62	60.8	35	51.5	97	57.1
No	40	39.2	33	48.5	73	42.9
Total	102	100.0	68	100.0	170	100.0

TABLE 27 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Use of a departmental syllabus for the basic speech course										
Yes	29	63.0	27	75.0	16	64.0	25	39.7	97	57.1
No	17	37.0	9	25.0	9	36.0	38	60.3	73	42.9
Total	46	100.0	36	100.0	25	100.0	63	100.0	170	100.0

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question, but there was a significant difference among the regions. Western States reported a higher percentage not using a departmental syllabus than the other regions.

More than half of the colleges reported they did follow a departmental syllabus for the basic speech course. Colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported less use of a syllabus than colleges in the smaller group. The larger colleges, with larger departments, probably reflect greater diversity among the staff who teach the basic speech course, and thus use a departmental syllabus less frequently.

Statement of Objectives for the Basic Speech Course

Table 28 reports responses to the question, "Is a written 'Statement of Objectives' given to all students who take the basic speech course?" Fifty-three per cent (90) of the reporting colleges replied yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 63 per cent (64) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 38 per cent (26) yes. Regional responses to this question showed all regions reporting 47 to 61 per cent of the colleges provided a written statement of objectives for the basic speech course.

There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported a significantly higher percentage of colleges using a written statement of objectives. On the same question, there was no significant difference among the four regions.

TABLE 28

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES FOR THE BASIC SPEECH COURSE

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Are students given a written statement of objectives						
Yes	64	62.7	26	37.7	90	52.6
No	38	37.3	43	62.3	81	47.4
Total	102	100.0	69	100.0	171	100.0

TABLE 28 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Are students given a written statement of objectives										
Yes	30	61.2	18	54.5	12	48.0	30	46.9	90	52.6
No	19	38.8	15	45.5	13	52.0	34	53.1	81	47.4
Total	49	100.0	33	100.0	25	100.0	64	100.0	171	100.0

The division of yes and no answers to the question of giving students a written statement of objectives was nearly equal. A slightly higher percentage of colleges answered yes. Among the regions, Central States reported the highest, and Western States the lowest, percentages of yes answers to the question.

Behavioral Terms in Statement of Objectives

Table 29 reports responses to the question, "If the students are given a 'Statement of Objectives,' are these objectives stated in behavioral terms?" Seventy per cent (73) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 69 per cent (49) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 71 per cent (24) yes. Regional responses to this question showed the four regions reporting 65 to 72 per cent of the colleges stated objectives in behavioral terms when statements of objectives were given to students.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions, on the colleges reporting use of behavioral terms in statements of objectives for the basic course in speech.

Of colleges that reported the use of a statement of objectives for the basic course in speech, a large number indicated the use of behavioral terms in the statement. The high percentage of colleges that reported use of behavioral terms indicates that, among colleges using a statement of objectives, there is wide acceptance of behavioral

TABLE 29

BEHAVIORAL TERMS IN STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
If students are given a written statement of objectives, are they stated in behavioral terms						
Yes	49	69.0	24	70.6	73	69.5
No	22	31.0	10	29.4	32	30.5
Total	71	100.0	34	100.0	105	100.0

TABLE 29 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
If students are given a written statement of objectives, are they stated in behavioral terms										
Yes	26	72.2	13	68.4	11	64.7	23	69.7	73	69.5
No	10	27.8	6	31.6	6	35.3	10	30.3	32	30.5
Total	36	100.0	19	100.0	17	100.0	33	100.0	105	100.0

terminology. All four regions were consistently high in reported percentages of use of behavioral terms in statements of objectives.

Enrollment in Speech and Theatre Courses

Table 30 reports responses to questions requesting the approximate total number of students enrolled in speech and theatre courses each semester or quarter. The data showed that 87 per cent (68,422) of the total were enrolled in speech courses, and 13 per cent (10,501) in theatre courses. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 86 per cent (26,992) in speech courses, and 14 per cent (4,557) in theatre courses. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 88 per cent (41,430) in speech courses, and 12 per cent (5,994) in theatre courses. Regional responses to this question showed all regions reporting approximately the same percentages as in the overall total.

The breakdown of percentages of students in speech courses and in theatre courses is remarkably consistent in both size groups of colleges and in the four regions. The enrollment in speech courses far exceeds the enrollment in theatre courses. The basic course in speech accounts for a great share of the total speech course enrollment. The consistency reported in the percentages suggests that, regardless of other factors, enrollment in speech and theatre courses follows a similar pattern in both size groups of colleges, and also in the four regions.

TABLE 30

ENROLLMENT IN SPEECH AND THEATRE COURSES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Total Students-All colleges	%	Total Students-All colleges	%	Total Students-All colleges	%
Enrolled in speech courses	26992	85.6	41430	87.5	68422	86.7
Enrolled in theatre courses	4557	14.4	5944	12.5	10501	13.3
Total	31549	100.0	47374	100.0	78923	100.0

TABLE 30 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Enrolled in speech courses	17770	87.2	13030	86.7	8140	84.5	29482	87.0	68422	86.7
Enrolled in theatre courses	2608	12.8	2003	13.3	1490	15.5	4400	13.0	10501	13.3
Total	20378	100.0	15033	100.0	9630	100.0	33882	100.0	78293	100.0

Speech Program Similarity with Four-Year Institutions

Table 31 reports responses to the question, "Can a student in the speech program of your school take approximately the same speech courses that he would be able to take in the first two years of the program at four year institutions in your area?" Eighty-six per cent (145) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 82 per cent (83) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 93 per cent (62) yes.

Regional responses to this question showed the four regions reporting 74 to 95 per cent of colleges in which a student could take approximately the same courses in the first two years of a four year institution in the area. Eastern States was at the low end of the percentage range, and Western States the high end. There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on similarity of speech programs with four year institutions.

A very high percentage of colleges reported students could take approximately the same courses they would find at four year institutions in the area. Both size groups of colleges, and all four regions, reported consistently high percentages of colleges with speech courses that were similar to the first two years of four-year institutions. The student who enters the community college usually can expect to find speech courses that are approximately the same as he would find in the first two years of a four-year institution in the area.

TABLE 31

SPEECH PROGRAM SIMILARITY WITH FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Can students take approximately the same speech courses they would find in the first two years of a four-year institution in your area						
Yes	83	82.2	62	92.5	145	86.3
No	18	17.8	5	7.5	23	13.7
Total	101	100.0	67	100.0	168	100.0

TABLE 31 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Can students take approximately the same speech courses they would find in the first two years of a four-year institution in your area										
Yes	38	82.6	25	73.5	22	88.0	60	95.2	145	86.3
No	8	17.4	9	26.5	3	12.0	3	4.8	23	13.7
Total	46	100.0	34	100.0	25	100.0	63	100.0	168	100.0

Speech Courses Other than University Parallel

Table 32 reports responses to the question, "Does the speech program of your school include any courses other than the parallel, or transfer, courses?" Sixty-three per cent (105) of reporting colleges answered no. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 69 per cent (69) no, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 54 per cent (36) no.

Regional responses to this question showed a wide variation in the availability of speech courses other than university parallel. Western States led the four regions with 56 per cent of colleges offering speech courses other than university parallel. Central and Southern States reported 36 and 31 per cent, and Eastern States reported the lowest figure with only 6 per cent offering speech courses other than university parallel.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question, but there was a significant difference among the four regions. Western States provided significantly more, and Eastern States significantly less, than the other regions of speech courses other than the university parallel.

Most of the reporting community colleges did not offer courses other than university parallel as part of their speech program. More colleges in the 5,000 or more group than in the 2,000-4,999 group reported the availability of courses other than university parallel, but they represented less than half of the reporting colleges in the 5,000 or more group. Among the regions, Western States was the only

TABLE 32

SPEECH COURSES OTHER THAN UNIVERSITY PARALLEL

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Are speech courses other than university-parallel available						
Yes	31	31.0	30	45.5	61	36.7
No	69	69.0	36	54.5	105	63.3
Total	100	100.0	66	100.0	166	100.0

TABLE 32 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Are speech courses other than university-parallel available										
Yes	17	36.2	2	6.2	8	30.8	34	55.7	61	36.7
No	30	63.8	30	93.8	18	69.2	27	44.3	105	63.3
Total	47	100.0	32	100.0	26	100.0	61	100.0	166	100.0

area to report more than half of the colleges with speech courses available other than university-parallel courses.

Although community colleges attempt to embrace a comprehensive educational philosophy, which differs from traditional higher educational philosophy, they included primarily the traditional speech courses in their speech programs. Apparently most community college speech programs did not provide for the needs of students who are not enrolled in university-parallel curricula.

Availability of Majors in Speech and Drama

Table 33 reports responses to the questions, "Does your school offer a drama major?" and "Does your school offer a speech major?" Forty per cent (68) of the reporting colleges answered yes to the question of offering a speech major. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 34 per cent (35), and colleges with 5,000 or more reported 49 per cent (33) offered a speech major. Regional responses to this question showed a speech major was available at 6 per cent of the colleges in the Eastern States, and at 38 to 55 per cent of the colleges in the other regions.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question, but there was a significant difference among the four regions. Western States reported a higher percentage, and Eastern States a lower percentage, of colleges that offered a speech major.

TABLE 33

AVAILABILITY OF MAJORS IN SPEECH AND DRAMA

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Does college offer a major in speech						
Yes	35	33.7	33	48.5	68	39.5
No	69	66.3	35	51.5	104	60.5
Total	104	100.0	68	100.0	172	100.0
Does college offer a major in drama						
Yes	31	30.4	43	62.3	74	43.3
No	71	69.6	26	37.7	97	56.7
Total	102	100.0	69	100.0	171	100.0

TABLE 33 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Does college offer a major in speech										
Yes	18	38.3	2	5.9	12	46.2	36	55.4	68	39.5
No	29	61.7	32	94.1	14	53.8	29	44.6	104	60.5
Total	47	100.0	34	100.0	26	100.0	65	100.0	172	100.0
Does college offer a major in drama										
Yes	15	31.9	8	22.9	12	48.0	39	60.9	74	43.3
No	32	68.1	27	77.1	13	52.0	25	39.1	97	56.7
Total	47	100.0	35	100.0	25	100.0	64	100.0	171	100.0

In response to the question of the availability of a drama major, 43 per cent (74) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 30 per cent (31) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 62 per cent (43) yes.

Regional responses to this question showed a drama major was available at 61 per cent (39) of the Western States colleges, and at 23 to 48 per cent of the colleges in the other regions.

There were significant differences between the two size groups of colleges and also among the four regions in response to the question of the availability of a drama major. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a significantly higher percentage of colleges with drama majors than colleges with 2,000-4,999 students. Also, Western States reported a significantly higher percentage of colleges with a drama major than the other regions.

Most community colleges did not offer majors in either speech or drama. The primary reason is probably that speech and drama usually are included in the liberal arts programs of the colleges.

Average Number of Credit Hours in the Speech Program

Table 34 reports responses, in terms of averages, to the question, "How many total hours of credit are included in the speech program?" Quarter hours were converted to semester hours to calculate the averages. The average number of credit hours for all reporting colleges was 23.1 Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported an average of 20.3, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 25.9.

TABLE 34

AVERAGE NUMBER OF CREDIT HOURS IN THE SPEECH PROGRAM

REGION	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS	COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS	TOTAL
	Average No. of Credit Hours	Average No. of Credit Hours	Average No. of Credit Hours
Central States	20.8*	30.9	25.9(51.7)
Eastern States	13.6	18.1	15.9(31.7)
Southern States	23.2	22.3	22.8(45.5)
Western States	23.5	32.3	27.9(55.8)
Total: Average No. of Credit Hours	20.3(81.1)	25.9(103.6)	23.1(184.7)

(Marginal figures in parentheses were used to compute the chi-square.)

*All averages are reported in semester hours of credit.

Regional averages of semester hours of credit in speech programs were: Central States, 25.9; Eastern States, 15.9; Southern States, 22.8; Western States, 27.9.

The differences in the average number of credit hours in the speech program were not significant. Eastern States, however, reported a lower average number of credit hours in speech programs, and Western States reported a higher average. Colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported a higher average number of credit hours than colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group. As the colleges increased in size to 5,000 or more, the average number of credit hours in the speech program increased from 20.3 to 25.9.

Average Number of Different Courses in the Speech Program

Table 35 reports the average number of different courses in speech programs, based on responses to the question, "How many different courses does the speech program include?" The average number of different courses for all reporting colleges was 9.0. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 7.8 different courses, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 10.3. Regional averages for numbers of different courses were: Central States, 10.0; Eastern States, 5.8; Southern States, 8.6; and Western States, 11.5.

There were no significant differences on the average number of different courses in the speech program within the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions.

TABLE 35

AVERAGE NUMBER OF DIFFERENT COURSES IN THE SPEECH PROGRAM

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS	COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS	TOTAL
REGION	Average No. of Courses	Average No. of Courses	Average No. of Courses
Central States	9.3	10.6	10.0(19.9)
Eastern States	3.9	7.7	5.8(11.6)
Southern States	8.5	9.4	8.6(17.9)
Western States	9.6	13.3	11.5(22.9)
Total: Average No. of Different Courses	7.8(31.3)	10.3(41.0)	9.0(72.3)

(Marginal figures in parentheses were used to compute the chi-square.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The average number of different courses increased as the size of the colleges increased. Central, Western and Southern States were approximately equal in the average number of different courses, while Eastern States reported an average number of courses that was less than the other regions.

Percentage of Courses in Theatre or Drama Within the Speech Program

Table 36 reports responses to the question, "Approximately what percentage of the courses in the speech program deal specifically with theatre or drama?" (Possible responses included 0 per cent, 20, 40, 60, or 80 per cent.) Forty-three per cent (56) of the reporting colleges indicated 0 per cent of their speech program courses dealt with theatre or drama; 25 per cent (32) reported theatre courses accounted for 20 per cent of their speech program; and 18 per cent (23) reported theatre courses accounted for 40 per cent of their speech program.

Colleges in both size groups reported percentages approximately the same as those in the overall total, with one exception. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 38 per cent (31) of the speech programs had 0 per cent of courses in theatre or drama, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 51 per cent (25) in that category.

Regional responses to this question showed a wide variation in the percentages of speech programs devoted to theatre courses. Of colleges that included no theatre courses in their speech programs, Eastern and Western States reported 58 and 55 per cent, while Southern

TABLE 36

PERCENTAGE OF COURSES IN THEATRE OR DRAMA WITHIN THE SPEECH PROGRAM

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Percentage of courses in theatre or drama						
0%	31	38.2	25	51.0	56	43.0
20%	21	25.9	11	22.4	32	24.6
40%	14	17.3	9	18.4	23	17.7
60%	10	12.3	4	8.2	14	10.7
80%	5	6.3	0	0.0	5	4.0
Total	81	100.0	49	100.0	130	100.0

TABLE 36 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Percentage of courses in theatre or drama										
0%	7	20.0	14	58.3	7	35.0	28	54.9	56	43.0
20%	14	40.0	4	16.7	4	20.0	10	19.6	32	24.6
40%	8	22.8	2	8.3	4	20.0	9	17.6	23	17.7
60%	6	17.2	0	0.0	5	25.0	3	5.9	14	10.7
80%	0	0.0	4	16.7	0	0.0	1	2.0	5	4.0
Total	35	100.0	24	100.0	20	100.0	51	100.0	130	100.0

and Central States reported 35 and 20 per cent. In the category of colleges that indicated 20 per cent of their speech programs dealt with theatre courses, Central States reported 40 per cent, and the other three regions 17 to 20 per cent. In the category of colleges that indicated 40 per cent of their speech programs dealt with theatre courses, Eastern States reported 8 per cent, and the other three regions 18 to 23 per cent.

The interpretation of the regional responses should allow consideration for other data that are relevant. Specifically, Western States reported 61 per cent of the colleges offered a major in drama (Table 33, p. 126), which suggests separate departments for drama courses, and Eastern States reported only 23 per cent of the colleges offered a major in drama, which suggests many of the remaining colleges did not offer courses in theatre or drama.

The chi-square test was applied to the data reported in Table 36 by combining two of the response categories into single units. These two categories included the small number of colleges reporting that 60 and 80 per cent of their speech programs dealt with theatre courses. There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on the percentages of courses within the speech program that dealt with theatre or drama.

More than one-half of the colleges reported the speech program did include courses that dealt specifically with theatre or drama. But a large minority reported no theatre courses were included in the speech program. The reasons for colleges reporting no theatre courses

in the speech program could be that many colleges have separate drama departments, which the respondents did not consider part of the speech program, and that many colleges did not include any theatre or drama courses in their program.

Availability and Frequency of A Basic Course in Theatre

Table 37 reports responses to the questions, "Is a basic course in theatre included in the speech program?" and "Is it offered once each year or every semester of quarter?" Fifty-seven per cent (94) of the reporting colleges answered yes to this question. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students replied 59 per cent (59) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 53 per cent (35) yes.

Regional responses to this question showed a basic course in theatre was included in the speech program offerings less frequently in the Eastern and Western States than in the Central and Southern States. The specific percentages for the regions showed Central and Southern States with 78 and 64 per cent of the colleges offering a basic course in theatre, and Eastern and Western States with 48 and 43 per cent.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question. There was a significant difference, however, among the four regions. The percentages from Central and Southern States were significantly higher than Eastern and Western States for colleges that offered a basic course in theatre as part of the speech program.

TABLE 37

AVAILABILITY AND FREQUENCY OF A BASIC COURSE IN THEATRE

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Is a basic course in theatre offered						
Yes	59	59.0	35	53.0	94	56.6
No	41	41.0	31	47.0	72	43.4
Total	100	100.0	66	100.0	166	100.0
If offered, is it given						
Once each year	23	37.3	8	22.9	31	33.0
Every semester or quarter	36	62.7	27	77.1	63	67.0
Total	59	100.0	35	100.0	94	100.0

TABLE 37 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is basic course in theatre offered										
Yes	35	77.8	16	48.5	16	64.0	27	42.9	94	56.6
No	10	22.2	17	51.5	9	36.0	36	57.1	72	43.4
Total	45	100.0	33	100.0	25	100.0	63	100.0	166	100.0
If offered, is it given										
Once each year	7	20.0	7	43.8	11	68.8	6	22.2	31	33.0
Every semester or quarter	28	80.0	9	56.2	5	31.2	21	77.8	63	67.0
Total	35	100.0	16	100.0	16	100.0	27	100.0	94	100.0

In response to the question of how often a basic course in theatre was offered, 32 per cent (30) of the colleges reported once each year, and 68 per cent (63) reported every semester or quarter. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 39 per cent (22) offered a basic theatre course once each year, and 61 per cent (35) every semester or quarter. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 22 per cent (8) offered a basic course in theatre once each year, and 78 per cent (28) every semester or quarter.

Regional responses to this question showed Central and Western States with 80 and 78 per cent of the colleges offering a basic course in theatre every semester or quarter. Eastern and Southern States reported 56 and 31 per cent of colleges in the same category.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question. There was, however, a significant difference among the regions. The basic course in theatre was offered less often in the Southern States than in the other regions.

Most responding colleges offered a basic course in theatre every semester or quarter. Both size groups and three of the regions reported a majority of colleges offering it every semester. The percentage of colleges offering this course every semester or quarter was slightly higher in the 5,000 or more group of colleges. Also, Southern States reported a higher percentage of colleges offering a basic course in theatre only once each year than the other regions.

Theatre Productions

Table 38 reports responses to the question, "Does the speech program of your school include a schedule of theatre productions?" Sixty-one per cent (104) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students replied 62 per cent (63) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 58 per cent (41) yes. Regional responses to this question showed three regions with a majority of colleges including a schedule of theatre productions in the speech program. The specific percentages for these three regions were: Central States, 76 per cent (35); Southern States, 68 per cent (17); and Eastern States, 57 per cent (21). Western States reported slightly less than half, 48 per cent (31), of colleges in this category.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges in response to this question. There was a significant difference, however, among the regions. Western States reported a lower percentage of speech programs that included a schedule of theatre productions than the other regions. This difference might be attributed to the large number of drama programs that apparently function outside the speech programs in many Western States' colleges (Table 33, p. 126, Table 39, p. 144, and Table 40, p. 145).

Most colleges reported that their speech program included a schedule of theatre productions. Both size groups were approximately equal in their responses to this question. Central States reported a higher percentage than the other regions of colleges that included a schedule of theatre productions as part of their speech program.

TABLE 38

THEATRE PRODUCTIONS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Does speech program include a schedule of theatre productions						
Yes	63	62.4	41	57.7	104	60.5
No	38	37.6	30	42.3	68	39.5
Total	101	100.0	71	100.0	172	100.0

TABLE 38 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Does speech program include a schedule of theatre productions										
Yes	35	76.1	21	56.8	17	68.0	31	48.4	104	60.5
No	11	23.9	16	43.2	8	32.0	33	51.6	68	39.5
Total	46	100.0	37	100.0	25	100.0	64	100.0	172	100.0

Average Number of Theatre Productions

Table 39 reports responses, in terms of averages, to the question, "How many major theatre productions are usually presented during the regular school year?" The average for all reporting colleges was 3.2. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported 2.7, and colleges with 5,000 or more students reported 3.7. Regional responses to this question were: Central States, 3.1; Eastern States, 3.1; Southern States, 3.1; and Western States, 3.6.

Colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported an average of one production more per year than colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group. The regional averages were identical, except for Western States, which reported a slightly higher average.

College Credit for Participation in Theatre Productions

Table 40 reports responses to the question, "Can students earn college credit for participation in theatre productions?" Sixty-two per cent (104) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 58 per cent (59) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 67 per cent (45) yes.

Regional responses to this question showed credit for participation in theatre productions was granted in 84 per cent (52) of the Western States' colleges. Other regional responses showed Central and Southern States reporting 58 per cent, and Eastern States reporting 31 per cent in this category.

TABLE 39

AVERAGE NUMBER OF THEATRE PRODUCTIONS

REGIONS	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS	COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS	TOTAL
	Average Number of Productions	Average Number of Productions	Average Number of Productions
Central States	2.8	3.3	3.1
Eastern States	2.4	3.7	3.1
Southern States	2.8	3.3	3.1
Western States	2.7	4.5	3.6
Total	2.7	3.7	3.2

TABLE 40

COLLEGE CREDIT FOR PARTICIPATION IN THEATRE PRODUCTIONS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENT		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Can students earn college credit for participation in theatre productions						
Yes	59	58.4	45	67.2	104	61.9
No	42	41.6	22	32.8	64	38.1
Total	101	100.0	67	100.0	168	100.0

TABLE 40 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Can students earn college credit for participation in theatre productions										
Yes	26	57.8	11	31.4	15	57.7	52	83.9	104	61.9
No	19	42.2	24	68.6	11	42.3	10	16.1	64	38.1
Total	45	100.0	35	100.0	26	100.0	62	100.0	168	100.0

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question. There was, however, a significant difference among the regions. Western States reported a higher percentage, and Eastern States a lower percentage, than the other regions on the number of colleges granting credit for participation in theatre productions.

Most colleges reported students can earn college credit for participation in theatre productions. The responses in the 5,000 or more group showed a higher percentage of colleges that gave students the opportunity to earn credit than in the 2,000-4,999 group. As the colleges increase in size, apparently there is a greater tendency to offer credit for this participation. Among the regions, Eastern States appeared to provide credit much less than the other areas. Conversely, Western States provided credit much more than the other areas.

Physical Facility for Theatre Productions

Table 41 reports responses to the question, "Are theatre productions usually presented in an improvised facility, a permanent theatre structure, or with other arrangements?" Fifty-seven per cent (93) of the colleges reported the use of a permanent theatre structure, and 33 per cent (54) reported the use of improvised facilities. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported permanent theatre structures in use in 66 per cent (47) of the colleges, while a lower percentage, 50 per cent (46) was reported by colleges in the 2,000-4,999

TABLE 41

PHYSICAL FACILITY FOR THEATRE PRODUCTIONS

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Are theatre productions presented in:						
an improvised facility	35	38.0	19	26.8	54(54)	33.1
a permanent theatre structure	46	50.0	47	66.2	93(93)	57.1
other	11	12.0	5	7.0	16	9.8
Total	92(81)	100.0	71(66)	100.0	163(147)	100.0

Category of other was eliminated to compute chi-square. Computation was based on marginal figures in parentheses.

TABLE 41 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Are theatre productions presented in:										
an improvised facility	18	41.9	11	34.4	7	29.2	18	28.1	54(54)	33.1
a permanent theatre structure	18	41.9	21	65.6	14	58.3	40	62.5	93(93)	57.1
other	7	16.2	0	0.0	3	12.5	6	9.4	16	9.8
Total	43 (36)	100.0	32 (32)	100.0	24 (21)	100.0	64 (58)	100.0	163 (147)	100.0

Category of other was eliminated to compute chi-square. Computation was based on marginal figures in parentheses.

group. The four regions reported a range of 42 to 66 per cent of colleges with permanent theatre structures.

The category of other arrangements was eliminated to apply the chi-square test to this question. There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a higher percentage of colleges with permanent theatre structures. On the same question, there was no significant difference among the four regions.

More than half of the responding colleges reported the use of a permanent theatre structure for theatre productions. Larger colleges tended to show a greater tendency to provide a permanent theatre structure than smaller colleges. Eastern States, which also reported a significantly higher membership in the American Theatre Association (Table 20, p. 86) than the other regions, reported the highest percentage of colleges with permanent theatre structures.

Intercollegiate Forensic Activities

Table 42 reports responses to the question, "Does the speech program of your school include intercollegiate forensic activities?" Fifty-seven per cent (98) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 51 per cent (52) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 67 per cent (46) yes.

Regional responses to this question showed Central, Southern, and Western States reporting a range of 63 to 69 per cent, while Eastern

TABLE 42

INTERCOLLEGIATE FORENSIC ACTIVITIES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Does speech program include intercollegiate forensic activities						
Yes	52	50.5	46	66.7	98	57.0
No	51	49.5	23	33.3	74	43.0
Total	103	100.0	69	100.0	172	100.0

TABLE 42 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Does speech program include inter-collegiate forensic activities										
Yes	32	68.1	8	22.9	18	69.2	40	62.5	98	57.0
No	15	31.9	27	77.1	8	30.8	24	37.5	74	43.0
Total	47	100.0	35	100.0	26	100.0	64	100.0	172	100.0

States reported only 23 per cent of colleges that offered intercollegiate forensic activities.

There was a significant difference between the two size groups of colleges in response to this question. Colleges with 5,000 or more students reported a higher percentage of intercollegiate forensic activities than colleges with 2,000-4,999 students. There was also a significant difference among the regions. Eastern States reported a lower percentage of colleges with intercollegiate forensic activities than the other three regions.

More than half of the reporting community colleges provided intercollegiate forensic activities as part of their speech program. Larger colleges, in the 5,000 or more group, showed a greater tendency than colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group to provide intercollegiate forensic activities. The increased number of staff and students in the larger colleges probably explain the higher percentage of intercollegiate forensic activities. Colleges in the Eastern States were least likely to provide intercollegiate forensic activities; the other three regions were approximately equal in the percentage of colleges with such programs. Eastern States' colleges also reported the lowest percentage of speech departments (Table 3, p. 30), which could account for the lower percentage of colleges providing intercollegiate forensic activities.

College Credit for Participation in Forensic Activities

Table 43 reports responses to the question, "Can students earn college credit for participation in forensic activities?" Fifty-two per cent (80) of the reporting colleges answered yes. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students answered 47 per cent (43) yes, and colleges with 5,000 or more students answered 58 per cent (37) yes. Regional responses to this question showed a wide range of percentages of colleges that offered credit for participation in forensic activities. The region reporting the lowest percentage was Eastern States, with 7 per cent (2) in this category, while Western States reported the highest figure, 74 per cent (42). Central and Southern States reported 52 per cent.

There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges on this question. There was, however, a significant difference among the four regions. Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges that offered credit for student participation in forensic activities, and Eastern States reported a lower percentage, than the other regions.

Approximately one-half of the responding colleges offered credit for participation in forensic activities. Colleges in the 5,000 or more group were more likely than colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group to offer this credit. Western States' colleges offered it more often than the other regions, and Eastern States' colleges provided almost no opportunities for students to earn credit for participation in forensic activities. The percentages of colleges that offered credit for

TABLE 43

COLLEGE CREDIT FOR PARTICIPATION IN FORENSIC ACTIVITIES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Can students earn college credit for participation in forensic activities						
Yes	43	47.3	37	57.8	80	51.6
No	48	52.7	27	42.2	75	48.4
Total	91	100.0	64	100.0	155	100.0

TABLE 43 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Can students earn college credit for participation in forensic activities										
Yes	23	52.3	2	6.9	13	52.0	42	73.7	80	51.6
No	21	47.7	27	93.1	12	48.0	15	26.3	75	48.4
Total	44	100.0	29	100.0	25	100.0	57	100.0	155	100.0

student participation in theatre productions (Table 40, p. 145) were higher than the percentages reported for participation in forensic activities. Apparently participation in theatre productions is more widely recognized than participation in forensic activities as a way to earn college credit.

Staff Time Used for Activities

Table 44 reports responses to the question, "Approximately what percentage of staff time is used for activities that do not produce student credit hours?" The most common response for all reporting colleges was 20 per cent of staff time used for non-student credit hour activities. Fifty-three per cent (75) of the colleges were in this category. A large number of colleges, 33 per cent (47), reported no staff time was used for non-student credit hour activities. Colleges with 2,000-4,999 students reported a higher figure, 60 per cent (54), than colleges with 5,000 or more students, 40 per cent (21), of colleges that used 20 per cent of staff time for non-student credit hour activities. The four regions reported a range of 41 to 64 per cent of colleges in this category.

The chi-square test was applied to the percentage of staff time used for activities that do not produce student credit hours by combining the categories of 40, 60, and 80 per cent into a single unit. There was no significant difference between the two size groups of colleges in responses to this question. There was a significant

TABLE 44

STAFF TIME USED FOR ACTIVITIES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Percentage of time used for non-student credit hour activities						
0%	25	27.7	22	42.3	47	33.0
20%	54	60.0	21	40.3	75	52.9
40%	10	11.2	7	13.6	17	12.0
60%	0	0.0	1	1.9	1	.7
80%	1	1.1	1	1.9	2	1.4
Total	90	100.0	52	100.0	142	100.0

TABLE 44 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Percentage of time used for non-student credit hour activities										
0%	11	25.5	3	12.0	7	33.3	26	49.0	47	33.1
20%	26	60.4	16	64.0	11	52.4	22	41.5	75	52.9
40%	4	9.3	6	24.0	2	9.5	5	9.5	17	11.9
60%	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	.7
80%	1	2.4	0	0.0	1	4.8	0	0.0	2	1.4
Total	43	100.0	25	100.0	21	100.0	53	100.0	142	100.0

difference, however, among the four regions. Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges that allowed no staff time for non-student credit hour activities than the other regions.

Approximately two-thirds of all responding colleges reported that staff time was used for activities that do not produce student credit hours. This usage of staff time suggests many community colleges recognize the legitimacy of activities in the speech program other than classroom instruction. Colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported a higher percentage of colleges that used staff time for these activities than colleges in the 5,000 or more group. Perhaps the larger colleges, with more sections of the basic speech course, have less time available for non-student credit hour activities.

Compensation for Staff Time Used for Activities

Table 45 reports responses to the question of whether staff time that does not produce student credit hours was part of regular load or overload. Sixty-two per cent (67) of the colleges reported this staff time was part of regular load. Colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported 57 per cent (37) of the colleges treated staff time used for activities as regular load, and colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported 70 per cent (30) treated it as regular load. Regional responses to this question showed a range of 50 to 88 per cent of colleges that considered staff time for activities as part of the regular load. Southern States reported the highest figure,

TABLE 45

COMPENSATION FOR STAFF TIME USED FOR ACTIVITIES

	COLLEGES WITH 2,000-4,999 STUDENTS		COLLEGES WITH 5,000 OR MORE STUDENTS		TOTAL	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Is staff time that does not produce student credit hours treated as						
part of regular load	37	56.9	30	69.8	67	62.0
overload	28	43.1	13	30.2	41	38.0
Total	65	100.0	43	100.0	108	100.0

TABLE 45 (continued)

	CENTRAL STATES		EASTERN STATES		SOUTHERN STATES		WESTERN STATES		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Is staff time that does not produce student credit hours treated as										
part of regular load	23	60.5	14	60.9	15	88.2	15	50.0	67	62.0
overload	15	39.5	9	39.1	2	11.8	15	50.0	41	38.0
Total	38	100.0	23	100.0	17	100.0	30	100.0	108	100.0

88 per cent (15), and Western States the lowest figure, 50 per cent (15), of colleges in this category.

There were no significant differences between the two size groups of colleges, or among the four regions, in responses to this question. Most colleges considered staff time for activities as part of the instructor's regular load. This treatment of staff time reinforces the interpretation that many community colleges recognize the importance of speech program activities other than classroom instruction. It also suggests that speech program staff are expected to work with students on activities other than classroom instruction as part of their regular load.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A four-page questionnaire (Appendix A, p. 196) was sent to all public, comprehensive, community colleges with enrollments of 2,000 or more, to gather normative data on speech programs in community colleges. Of 327 colleges that met the criteria, 175 colleges, or slightly more than 53 percent, returned usable responses. These 175 responses included 59 per cent (104) from colleges with 2,000 to 4,999 students, and 41 per cent (71) from colleges with 5,000 or more students.

The regional distribution of responses included 27 per cent (48) from Central States, 20 per cent (36) from Eastern States, 15 per cent (26) from Southern States, and 37 per cent (65) from Western States. These responses provided the basic data for this report. In addition to the normative data presented in the study, the data were treated in the variables of two size groups of colleges, and four different regions of the country. The chi-square test, set at the level of 0.05, was used to assess statistically significant differences among the variables.

SUMMARY

The data in this survey were analyzed in five basic areas related to speech programs in community colleges: organizational information, role and responsibilities of the speech program chairman, staff, courses, and activities. The following summary describes the analysis of the data and the significant differences that were noted. The five areas are summarized in the order in which they appear on the questionnaire.

Organizational Information

Approximately one-half of the community colleges included in this survey had departments specifically for the speech program. The departments were located in a division of the college, in which one or more other departments were also located. The most frequently reported titles for the department in which the speech program was located were Speech Department and Speech-Drama Department. These titles accounted for more than one-third of the speech program departments in all of the responding colleges.

Approximately two-thirds of the responding colleges reported speech and theatre courses were offered in the same department, and approximately two-thirds of the respondents supported the statement that the speech program in a community college should be treated as a single, separate department.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported departments specifically for the speech program.
2. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported use of department titles of Speech Department or Speech-Drama Department.
3. Central and Southern States reported higher percentages than Eastern and Western States of colleges in which speech and theatre courses were offered in the same department.

Role and Responsibilities of the Speech Program Chairman

Approximately one-half of the chairmen of the speech programs were recognized officially with the title of Department Chairman. Two-thirds of the colleges provided a reduced teaching load for the department chairman, and one-half of the colleges reported the reduction was either 20% or 40% of a normal load.

Almost all speech program chairmen were responsible for planning and administering the budget, scheduling classes, and recruiting new faculty. More than one-half of the chairmen evaluated staff and made recommendations for promotion, and approximately three-fourths of the chairmen were assisted by other staff members in evaluation processes.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported the official title of Department Chairman was used to recognize the speech program chairman.
2. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported that the chairman was responsible to plan and administer the budget.
3. Eastern and Central States reported higher percentages than Southern and Western States of colleges in which the chairman was responsible to evaluate and recommend instructors for promotion and salary increase.

Staff

More than three-fourths of the responding colleges reported the normal teaching load for speech program staff was fifteen hours. Two-thirds of the responding colleges provided compensation for out-of-class responsibilities, either in the form of a reduction in teaching load or additional income.

Approximately one-half of the speech program staff reported by the respondents held the Master's as their highest degree, and an additional one-third had completed thirty graduate hours past the Master's Degree. One in ten of the speech program staff held the Ph.D. degree. One in three of the staff was currently enrolled in a graduate program, and in three-fourths of the reported cases, the graduate program was the Ph.D.

Almost all staff members taught the basic speech course as part of their load. More than one-third of the staff held membership in the Speech Communication Association. The expected additions to staff for the next five years were predicted to be gradual, with a five year total of 315 additional staff members reported by the respondents. Approximately two-thirds of the respondents supported the suggestion that graduate schools should develop programs that give special emphasis to the preparation of teachers who will work in speech programs in community colleges.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. Although all regions reported 15 hours as the normal staff load in most cases, Central and Eastern States reported higher percentages than Southern and Western States of colleges in which 12 hours was the normal load.
2. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported that staff were compensated for out-of-class responsibilities.
3. Central and Southern States reported higher percentages than Western and Eastern States for colleges that provided compensation for staff for out-of-class responsibilities.
4. Western States reported a lower percentage of colleges that used reduction in teaching load as the method of compensation for out-of-class responsibilities.
5. Western States reported a lower percentage of staff members who held Ph.D. degrees.
6. Colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported higher percentages of the use of part time staff than colleges in the 5,000 or more group.
7. Central and Eastern States reported higher percentages than Southern and Western States of staff members enrolled in graduate programs.
8. A higher percentage of colleges in the 2,000 to 4,999 group reported the basic speech course as part of the teaching load for the staff.
9. Southern and Western States reported higher percentages than Central and Eastern States of memberships in Phi Rho Pi.
10. Colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported higher percentages of memberships in the Speech Communication Association than colleges in the 5,000 or more group.
11. Eastern States reported a lower percentage of memberships in the Speech Communication Association than the other regions.

Courses

The average number of sections of the basic speech course for all responding colleges was 12, and the average class size was reported equally as 25-29 or 20-24 by most of the colleges. One-third of the colleges reported Communication was the area of emphasis in the basic speech course. One-fourth of the colleges reported that a departmental syllabus was used for the basic speech course, and more than half of

the colleges also reported that students were given a written statement of objectives for the basic speech course.

Approximately nine out of ten students in speech program courses were enrolled in speech courses, and one in ten was enrolled in a theatre course. Approximately nine out of ten responding colleges reported that students could take speech programs that were approximately the same as those offered in the first two years of four-year institutions in the area. Almost two-thirds of the responding colleges reported their speech programs did not include any courses other than the university parallel courses.

More than one-third of the colleges reported students could take a major in speech or drama. The average number of semester credit hours in the speech program for all responding colleges was 23.1. The average number of different courses was 9. More than half of the responding colleges reported that theatre courses were included in the speech program.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. Eastern States reported a higher percentage of colleges that emphasized Public Speaking in the basic speech course than the other regions.
2. Western States reported a lower percentage of colleges that used a departmental syllabus for the basic speech course than the other regions.
3. A higher percentage of colleges in the 2,000-4,999 group reported giving students a written statement of objectives for the basic speech course.
4. Eastern States reported a lower percentage, and Western States reported a higher percentage, of colleges that offer courses other than the university parallel courses as part of the speech program.

5. Eastern States reported a lower percentage, and Western States reported a higher percentage, of colleges that offered a speech major.
6. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported the speech program included a drama major.
7. Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges that offered a drama major than the other regions.
8. Central States reported a higher percentage of colleges that offered a basic course in theatre as part of the speech program.
9. Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges that offered a basic course in theatre every semester or quarter.

Activities

Almost two-thirds of the responding colleges reported a schedule of theatre productions as part of the speech program. The average number of theatre productions reported was 3.2. Almost two-thirds of the responding colleges reported students can earn college credit for participation in theatre productions, and more than half of the colleges reported the use of a permanent theatre building for productions.

More than half of the responding colleges reported intercollegiate forensic activities as part of the speech program, and more than half of the colleges also reported that students can earn college credit for participation in forensic activities. Two-thirds of the responding colleges reported that 20% or more of staff time was used for activities, and almost two-thirds of the colleges considered this staff time as part of the normal load for instructors.

The statistical analysis of the variables revealed the following significant differences:

1. Western States reported a lower percentage of colleges with

a schedule of theatre production as part of the speech program than the other regions.

2. Eastern States reported a lower percentage, and Western States reported a higher percentage, of colleges that offered credit for participation in theatre productions.
3. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported the use of a permanent theatre building for productions.
4. A higher percentage of colleges in the 5,000 or more group reported intercollegiate forensic activities as part of the speech program.
5. Eastern States reported a lower percentage of colleges with intercollegiate forensic activities than the other regions.
6. Eastern States reported a lower percentage, and Western States reported a higher percentage, of colleges that offered credit for student participation in forensic activities.
7. Western States reported a higher percentage of colleges in which no staff time was used for non-student credit hour activities than the other regions.

CONCLUSION

The data reported in this study tend to raise many questions, especially in the areas of interpretation and implementation. Not all of the relevant questions can be answered within the parameters of this investigation. While the overall intent was to provide additional information regarding speech programs in community colleges, the data are limited, for the most part, to descriptive statistics that give a profile of key aspects of these programs. Five purposes were identified for the study: (1) to assess the status of speech programs in community colleges; (2) to identify trends that have developed, or are developing, which affect these programs; (3) to compare speech programs in two size groups of colleges, 2,000-4,999 and more than 5,000; (4) to compare speech programs in community colleges in

different regions of the country; (5) to provide information to aid new and growing community colleges to evaluate certain aspects of their speech programs. The following conclusions relate to these purposes.

Status of Speech Programs in Community Colleges

Numerous indicators suggest that speech programs are well established as integral parts of community colleges. The existence of departments, the number and training of staff, the diversity of courses, and the number of students in speech program courses, all show the general acceptance of speech programs in these colleges.

The data also show that students in most community colleges can expect to find speech program courses similar to those offered in the first two years of universities and four-year institutions in their area. While the availability of university parallel courses can be considered a strength in community colleges, it also relates to a major weakness. Most community college speech programs do not include courses other than university parallel to service the students in occupational, continuing education, or remedial curricula. This omission suggests that most community college speech programs do not reflect the comprehensive philosophy of the community college.

Trends

Since approximately half of the colleges reported speech departments, the trend seems to be toward the organization of separate speech departments in community colleges. These departments usually

have a chairman with reduced teaching load, and they include courses in both speech and theatre. Although this trend suggests a pattern similar to departments in many four-year institutions and universities, other data indicate major differences.

Almost all staff members in speech programs in community colleges teach the basic course in speech, regardless of their specialization in graduate training. This trend suggests the development of a generalist who teaches the basic speech course and also has competence in other areas. Another trend is toward acceptance of fifteen credit hours as the normal teaching load, which is higher than many four-year institutions and universities.

Since one-third of the speech program staff had completed thirty graduate hours past the Master's degree, and one-third were currently enrolled in graduate programs, the trend toward higher educational standards for staff is strong. Other trends were observed in the analysis of the variables, which follows.

Comparison of the Two Size Groups of Colleges

Colleges with 5,000 or more students outranked the colleges with 2,000 to 4,999 students in almost every area where significant difference emerged. The larger colleges reported more speech departments, more department chairmen with broader responsibilities, fewer part time staff members, more opportunities for staff to specialize, more permanent theatre facilities for productions, and more programs that included intercollegiate forensic activities. While speech

programs are well established in nearly all of the community colleges, the larger colleges have more of the perquisites of well developed speech programs.

One area, however, where larger community colleges have failed to demonstrate leadership is the development of speech program courses other than university parallel. Colleges in the 5,000 or more group serve larger and more heterogeneous student populations, and consequently have greater need to develop options for students in programs other than university parallel. Since the data show no significant progress in this area, the larger as well as the smaller colleges apparently have failed to reflect the comprehensive philosophy of community colleges in their speech program courses.

Comparison of the Colleges in the Four Regions

The analysis of the data in this study did not provide a basis for ranking the regions in terms of the best speech programs in one region, the second in another, and so forth. Although significant differences emerged in several areas, the speech programs in the community colleges in the four regions did not differ significantly in most of the areas surveyed in this study. In several of the areas in which differences were observed, Western States gave evidence of well developed speech programs, and Eastern States revealed less developed speech programs than the other regions.

Specifically, Western States appeared strong in these areas: availability of speech program courses parallel to the first two years

of university programs, availability of speech program courses other than university parallel, availability of majors in speech and drama, number of credit hours in the speech program, number of different courses in the speech program, and granting college credit to students for participation in theatre productions.

Eastern States appeared weak in the following areas: availability of speech departments, membership in the Speech Communication Association, total enrollment in speech program courses, availability of speech program courses parallel to the first two years of university programs, availability of speech program courses other than university parallel, availability of majors in speech and drama, number of credit hours in the speech program, number of different courses in the speech program, granting college credit to students for participation in theatre programs, and availability of intercollegiate forensic programs.

New and Growing Community Colleges

New community colleges, as well as those already developed, can use the information in this study to evaluate key aspects of their speech programs. Comparisons can be made on the basis of the size and region of colleges. Specific areas useful for an evaluation include: departmental organization, professional background of staff, role and responsibilities of speech program chairmen, class size for the basic speech course, credit hours offered in the speech program, teaching load, physical facilities for theatre productions, and methods of compensation for out-of-class speech program activities.

The data in this study show a wide acceptance of the importance of the educational opportunities provided in speech programs. New community colleges, consequently, should commit themselves to the development of the best speech programs their resources permit. Other community colleges, already developed, should adapt their speech programs to their heterogeneous student populations, with special attention to the needs of students who are not enrolled in university parallel curricula.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the surface, the data presented in this survey can support the thesis that speech programs in community colleges are adequately developed. Yet, in some of the less obvious ways, these speech programs reflect fundamental social and educational problems. While growth has been rapid in numbers, community colleges have not maintained an equal pace in the development of programs that respond to emerging social and educational needs. The following recommendations are based on the thesis that, despite their numerous strengths, speech programs in community colleges have not responded adequately to the needs of their students and of their communities.

Speech Program Courses

The status of courses reveals one of the most serious problems in community college speech programs. Two-thirds of the speech programs offer only the same courses found in four-year institutions in the

first two years. These speech programs offer no courses to meet the specific needs of students in occupational, continuing education, or remedial curricula.

Recommendation: The speech program of the community college should provide courses in addition to the university parallel. These courses should be designed to meet the needs of students not enrolled in university parallel curricula.

Variety of Courses in the Speech Program

Students in the community college should have several courses from which to select in the speech program. Conversely, limitations of staff and budget usually preclude offering a large number of courses in the speech program of the community college. Courses should include introductory offerings in the areas of the field of speech, but should not include specialization that is inappropriate for the first two years of college work. Courses should be planned to serve the needs of the students rather than the staff.

Recommendation: A variety of courses in basic areas should be offered to students in the community college speech program, but courses in specialized, advanced areas should not be attempted. It is well to point out, however, the changing nature of levels in higher education. Many courses that were upper division twenty or thirty years ago are now lower division, and many courses currently taught were nonexistent a few years ago.

Basic Speech Course

This course is the largest one in the community college speech program. It is usually offered as a university parallel course, but many students in the community college will not transfer to a university. The appropriateness of the university parallel course for students who will not transfer to a university is doubtful. Since this course, however, is most often selected by students, it should be adapted to their needs.

Recommendation: Adapt the level and content of the basic speech course to the abilities of the students in the class. The primary emphasis should be on the progress the students can achieve, rather than on university parallel requirements.

Emphasis of the Basic Speech Course

The primary need for most students in the basic speech course in a community college is interpersonal communication skills, because they encounter most communication opportunities and problems in that area. Other areas may be included, but they should not receive primary emphasis.

Recommendation: Emphasis of the basic speech course should be on practical interpersonal communication skills and theories, and should relate to the problems students encounter in everyday communication experiences.

Selecting a Textbook for the Basic Speech Course

Many of the textbooks for the basic speech course seem to be written with the instructor, not the student, in mind. Authors frequently report current research related to speech communication, but they do not adapt the material to the student in a basic speech course in a community college.

Recommendation: In selecting a textbook for the basic speech course in a community college, primary consideration should be given to the potential usefulness of the book for the student.

Basic Course in Theatre

The basic course in theatre in a community college should appeal to students as a part of liberal arts education. It should not be a course that interests only theatre majors. The primary emphasis of the course should be to make the theatre experience a lifetime activity for the student.

Recommendation: The basic course in theatre should emphasize appreciation, and should consider its effectiveness primarily in the affective domain of learning.

Evening Classes

A major responsibility of community colleges is to provide opportunities for persons other than the normal age group of post-secondary students. Frequently, these students have been away from school for a number of years, having worked in business or industry, or at home raising children. These persons expect educational programs

that they can use, and the speech program should provide them. Because these students differ from day students, special efforts should be made to adapt course offerings to their needs.

Recommendation: A full program of speech program courses should be provided for evening students. The courses should focus on the special needs of the more mature student.

Goals for Community College Speech Programs

The goals for community college speech programs need to be identified and stated. Although many speech program staff engage in discussions about appropriate objectives, very few programs have produced written statements of goals. The wide diversity of community colleges suggests the need for a comprehensive "position paper" on the appropriate role of speech programs in these colleges.

Recommendation: A committee of knowledgeable persons from community colleges and from universities should develop a "position paper" for community college speech programs. This committee could function through the auspices of the Speech Communication Association.

Diversity of Goals

Speech programs in community colleges can function effectively with different goals, depending on the specific needs of the community and the students served by the speech program. The criteria for appropriate goals should be based on the needs of the students and community.

Recommendation: Every community college speech program should develop its goals on the basis of the needs of the students and community served by the college. The goals should be stated in written form.

Speech Departments

The status of a department frequently provides opportunities for the staff to exert influence over the budget, courses, and other areas of concern. Since the speech program includes courses and activities that are different from other areas of the college, and since the speech program requires a staff with special skills and interests, it should be organized as a separate department in the college.

Recommendation: Speech programs in community colleges should be organized in separate departments.

Articulation with Four Year Institutions

Because of their mutual concern with the welfare and progress of the student, speech program faculty in two-year and four-year institutions should articulate their programs to avoid repetition. Articulation should be based on mutual respect for the programs of both the two-year and four-year institutions, and on the need for flexibility. Neither institution should assume it can make educational decisions for the other, but both should accept the responsibility to work together with primary consideration for the student.

Recommendation: Speech program staff in two-year and four-year institutions should respect and cooperate with each other to provide the best program for students. They should adopt the attitude that the essence of articulation must be a dynamic, not a static, relationship.

In-Service Programs for Staff

A current report, People for the People's College, published by the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, observed that "programs for preservice and inservice education are mostly non-existent, or inappropriate where they do exist."[1] Although speech program staff have usually completed a Master's degree, their education has not prepared them to teach in a community college. Joseph W. Fordyce, President of the American Association of Junior Colleges, stated that "community-junior colleges have been required to a very large extent to remold and remake university graduates so that they can perform adequately as teachers at the community college level."[2]

---

[1]People for the People's College: A Summary, A Report Prepared by the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development (Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, 1972), p. 7.

[2]Ibid.

Recommendation: The speech program in community colleges should include in-service programs to help staff members adjust to the special problems of working in community colleges. Teaching skills and new instructional methods should be emphasized in these programs.

Graduate School Programs

Joseph P. Cosand, U.S. Deputy Commissioner of Education and former President of the Junior College District of St. Louis, observed:

> There are practically no strong preservice collegiate programs for community college staff members, and those that are provide only a small fraction of the qualified personnel needed. An increasing number of so-called preservice programs have been established, but they are generally inadequate or worse than nothing.[3]

The typical graduate school program in the field of speech relates in only a general way to the needs of a student who plans to work in a community college. To improve graduate programs in the field of speech, a cooperative effort between the graduate staff and the community college staff might yield positive results.

Recommendation: Graduate school programs should include options for students who want to prepare for careers in community college speech programs. To develop these programs, graduate staff should consult community college staff.

---

[3]Ibid. p. 8.

Staff Enrolled in Graduate Programs

Many of the staff members currently working in community college speech programs are also enrolled part-time in graduate programs. Wherever feasible, the graduate work should be related to the community college speech program. The graduate staff should support the community college staff who attempt to relate graduate work to the community college speech program.

Recommendation: Community college speech program staff enrolled in graduate courses should relate their graduate work to their work in the community college, and graduate staff members should support these efforts.

Staff Enrolled in Ph.D. Programs

Many community college speech program staff are currently enrolled in Ph.D. programs, and are considering appropriate research topics for dissertations. These students should give very careful attention to the issues emerging in community colleges, and in the field of speech as it relates to community colleges.

Recommendation: Community college speech program staff who are currently exploring dissertation topics should give careful attention to research areas in community college speech programs, some of which are identified in this study.

Graduate Programs for the Basic Course in Speech

Nearly all staff members in community college speech programs teach the basic course in speech, yet few have professional training

in the specific area of teaching this course. Frequently, the staff member's graduate program included courses related to the basic speech course, but did not include work directly related to the problems he is most likely to encounter when he teaches this course in a community college.

Recommendation: The basic course in speech is taught by almost all community college speech program staff, and consequently, graduate programs should provide opportunities to prepare for this specific teaching assignment.

Cooperation With Graduate Staff

The relationship between speech program staff in the community college and the graduate college is under-developed. Through a sharing of ideas, the graduate faculty might be in a better position to offer professional training to prospective community college speech program staff members.

Recommendation: Graduate faculties and community college staff should increase their efforts to achieve greater cooperation in areas of mutual concern, especially regarding graduate programs for new community college speech program staff.

New Staff for Community College Speech Programs

The availability of many qualified applicants for positions in community colleges indicates competition will be sharp, and only the best qualified will be placed. New staff members can be expected to

have experiences or courses that relate directly to work in a community college speech program.

Recommendation: In addition to all of the characteristics normally associated with an outstanding candidate for a position, the new staff member for a community college should have in his background specific educational experiences that relate to his assignment in a community college speech program.

Staff Involvement in the Community

The speech program staff of the community college should be involved in the community served by the college. Unfortunately, in most instances, unless the staff actively pursues and develops a role in the affairs of the community, this involvement will not be developed.

Recommendation: Staff should be involved in the affairs of the community. They should adapt the speech program to the needs of the community, and they should identify the needs through first-hand experiences in community activities.

Using Staff Resources

Speech program staff in community colleges frequently have knowledge and skills that should be more fully used. This expertise needs to be channeled into programs in which staff members can share with each other knowledge and instructional techniques.

Recommendation: Experienced staff members in the community college speech program should share with younger staff members their

expertise in working with the numerous problems in a community college; younger staff members should share with the more experienced staff members their current knowledge of developments in speech communication, based on their recent experiences as graduate students.

Membership in Professional Associations

Community college speech program staff frequently show little interest in professional associations. Since the professional association provides an important opportunity to stay abreast of current developments, effort should be made to increase community college staff participation in professional associations.

Recommendation: Community college speech program staff should be encouraged to hold membership and participate in professional associations.

Orientation for Part-Time Staff

The part-time staff member in the speech program is frequently the most neglected member of the department. Normally, he arrives on campus to teach his class and departs immediately afterward. He has little opportunity to become familiar with the philosophy of the community college. The full-time speech program staff have the responsibility to provide an orientation program for part-time staff members.

Recommendation: All part-time speech program staff should complete an orientation program provided by full-time staff. The

orientation should emphasize community college philosophy, and should introduce the part-time staff member to the goals of the speech program in the community college.

College Credit for Theatre Productions

The student who takes a role or a crew assignment in a theatre production is undertaking a learning experience. Usually, the student will work harder on a theatre production than he does in regular classes. This work should be recognized officially by the community college.

Recommendation: Students should be able to earn credit for participation in theatre productions.

Physical Facility for Theatre Productions

The advantages of a permanent theatre structure to accomodate a theatre program are numerous. In many instances, however, a permanent theatre building is not available solely for theatre use. When a theatre building is not available, the responsibility to provide theatre experiences for students and community is still present, and the speech program staff with background in theatre should accept the responsibility.

Recommendation: Community colleges should provide theatre programs as part of their cultural responsibilities to students and to the community, even in instances where facilities must be improvised for theatre production.

Forensic Activities

Students in the speech program of a community college should have opportunities to participate in forensic activities. They should also earn college credit for this participation. The activities should relat to the interests and needs of the students. Competition is appropriate, but the limited resources of the community college suggest that a new type of forensic program should be designed.

Recommendation: New forms for forensic programs should be developed for community college students, and college credit should be granted for participation.

Areas for Further Research

In many ways this study only touched the surface of community college speech programs. The data are quantitative, and thus many qualitative issues remain unexplored. The study of qualitative aspects of community college speech programs will require investigation in specific areas in great detail. Following are suggestions of areas in need of additional research.

Recommendation: Research should be continued in the following areas: speech program courses other than university parallel; innovations in the speech program of community colleges; improving graduate programs for potential community college speech program staff; developing in-service training programs for community college speech program staff; developing compensatory speech education courses for students with special needs; professional association activities of

community college speech program staff; instructional techniques developed by community college speech program staff; development of appropriate textual materials for community college speech programs; and articulation problems in speech programs in two year and four year institutions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, Dolores M. (ed.). Theatre in the Junior College. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Theatre Association, 1964.

Adams, Mary Anne. "A Survey of the Status of Speech Education in the Public Two-Year Colleges of Missouri As They Compare to Other Missouri Colleges," Missouri Speech Journal, 1:29-38, April, 1971.

Berko, Roy M. "Speech Programs at Coeducational Community-Junior Colleges." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1971.

Bietry, J. Richard. "The Junior College in Relation to Speech Education," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 17:202-216, April, 1931.

Blocker, Clyde E., et al. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

Brewington, Arthur W. "A Survey of Speech Education in the American Junior College," Abstract from Contribution No. 292. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1941.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The Open-Door Colleges: Policies for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Collins, Ray E. "Junior College Speech Curriculum," Western Speech, 25:153-156, Summer, 1961.

Cosand, Joseph P. "The Community College in 1980," Campus 1980. Edited by Alvin C. Enrich. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1968.

Eells, Walter C. The Junior College. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1931.

Eisenstadt, Arthur. "Speech Education Survey on New Jersey Junior Colleges," Speech Teacher, 2:273-282, November, 1953.

Erickson, Marceline. "Speech in the Junior Colleges of Our Fifty States and the District of Columbia," Unpublished Study, Speech Communication Association, New York, 1968.

Fox, Wayne O. and Thorrel B. Fest. "The Status of Speech in Western Junior Colleges," Speech Teacher, 1:199-203, September, 1952.

Frair, Don. "Methods and Trends in the Junior College Basic Speech Course," Western Speech, 34:148-153, Spring, 1970.

Gardner, John W. No Easy Victories. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.

Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Garrison, Roger H. Teaching in a Junior College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. (ed.). American Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. This Is the Community College. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1968.

Harper, William A. (ed.). 1971 Junior College Directory. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971.

Hoch, Irene Childrey. "Aims of Speech Training in the Junior College," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 19:369-374, June, 1933.

Johnston, Russell R. "Speech Activities in Junior Colleges," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 19:375-379, June, 1933.

Kelley, Win. "Speech Instruction in California Community Colleges," Speech Teacher, 19:211-224, September, 1970.

Kelley, Win. "Speech-Status, Trends, Innovations in California," Junior College Journal, 40:27-29, April, 1970.

Koos, Leonard V. The Junior College Movement. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1925.

Kranish, Carl William. "A Study of the Current Speech Programs of Eleven Michigan Junior Colleges," Speech Monographs, 17:122-127, August, 1950.

Larson, P. Merville. "The Junior College: A Challenge to Speech Educators," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 19:499-508, December, 1943.

Larson, P. Merville. "Speech Courses for the Junior College Terminal Curricula," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 29:360-362, October, 1943.

Mariner, Sylvia D. "Speech Survey of Junior Colleges," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 14:239-244, April, 1938.

The National Study of English in the Junior College. A Joint Project of The Modern Language Association, The National Council of Teachers of English, and The American Association of Junior Colleges. New York: The ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of English in Higher Education, Modern Language Association, 1970.

O'Grady, James Patrick Jr. "The Role of the Departmental Chairman in Selected Missouri and Illinois Two-Year Colleges," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri, 1969.

Padrow, Ben. "Speech Education in the California Junior Colleges," Speech Teacher, 8:58-62, January, 1959.

People for the People's College: A Summary. A Report Prepared by the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development. Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, 1972.

Report on Higher Education. A Report Prepared by a Ford Foundation Task Force. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Roberts, Carolyn M. "A Survey of Speech Education in United States Junior Colleges." Unpublished Master's thesis, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, 1967.

Taylor, Anita. "Speech and Theatre in Public Community Colleges, 1968-69," Speech Teacher, 19:62-67, January, 1970.

Thornton, James W. Jr. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1960.

Wallace, Karl R. (ed.). History of Speech Education in America. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.

Wolvin, Darlyn R. and Andrew Wolvin. "The Speech Communication Curriculum in the Community College," Today's Speech, 20:9-13, Fall, 1972.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE ON SPEECH PROGRAMS IN LARGE COMMUNITY COLLEGES

If you find space inadequate for comments, please circle the number of the question, attach an extra sheet, note the question number, and comment as completely as you wish. All comments will be read carefully.

(Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed, stamped, addressed envelope to: Arthur C. Meyer, Speech Dep't. Florissant Valley Community College, St. Louis, Missouri 63135.)

SPEECH PROGRAM is defined as: all areas traditionally associated with the "field of speech." It includes, but is not limited to, fundamentals, speech-communication, theatre, public speaking, interpretation, radio and television, speech and hearing disorders, forensics, debate, and speech-education.

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Does your institution include both "Departments" and "Divisions" in its administrative structure? Yes ___ No ___ If answer is yes, are "Divisions" normally larger than "Departments"? Yes ___ No ___

2. Does your institution have a "Department" specifically for the speech program? (Please use the definition of "speech program" stated above throughout this questionnaire.) Yes ___ No ___

3. What is the name of the department in which the speech program is organized?

   ___a. Speech Department
   ___b. Speech-Drama Department
   ___c. English Department
   ___d. Humanities Department
   ___e. Speech-Communication Department
   ___f. Other (Please specify) _____

4. Are courses in theatre offered in the same administrative unit that offers other speech courses? Yes ___ No ___

5. In your opinion, should the speech program in a community college be treated as a separate, single department? Yes ___ No ___

CHAIRMAN OF THE SPEECH PROGRAM

6. Is your official title "Department Chairman"? Yes ___ No ___ If answer is no, please give title: _____

7. Is the chairman given a reduced teaching load? Yes ___ No ___

8. What percentage of a full load does the department chairman normally teach? 0%__, 20%__, 40%__, 60%__, 80%__, 100%__

9. Does the chairman plan and administer the budget for his area? Yes ___ No ___

10. Does the chairman schedule the classes for faculty in his area? Yes ___ No ___

11. When staff openings occur in the speech program, does the chairman evaluate and recommend candidates for the positions? Yes ___ No ___

12. Does the chairman evaluate and recommend instructors for promotion and salary increase? Yes ___ No ___ If answer is yes, is the chairman assisted in this task by other staff members? Yes ___ No ___

STAFF

13. The normal teaching load for faculty in the speech program is: 9__, 12__, 15__, 18__, Other__ (Please specify) _____ Are these semester hours___, or quarter hours___?

14. Are instructors in the speech program compensated for major and out-of-class assignments such as directing a play or coaching a debate team? Yes ___ No ___

15. If compensation is provided, is it in the form of:

__a. a reduction in teaching load
__b. additional income
__c. other(Please specify) _____

16. Please use the following grid to describe only the administrative unit that you consider to be the Speech Department of your institution:

	Sex M(no.)F		Highest Degree(State no.) BA MA MAT MA+30 EdD PhD Other
Number of full-time instructors:	__	__	__ __ __ ____ __ __ ____
Number of part-time instructors:	__	__	__ __ __ ____ __ __ ____

17. How many instructors in the speech program do not hold a degree in the field of speech? _____

18. How many instructors in the speech program are currently enrolled in a graduate program? _____

19. Of the number enrolled in a graduate program, how many are working toward a: PhD__, EdD__, MA__, MAT__, Other__(Please specify)_____

20. Of the total number of instructors in the speech program, how many full-time instructors teach the basic speech course? _____ (Please state number) How many part-time? _____

21. Please state the number of staff in your speech program, including yourself, who belong to the following professional organizations:

__a. Speech Communication Association
__b. American Educational Theatre Association
__c. Regional Speech Association
__d. State Speech Association
__e. Phi Rho Pi
__f. American Association of University Professors
__g. Other (Please specify) _____

22. How many full-time staff members do you expect to add to your speech program within the next year? _____ Within the next five years? _____

23. In your opinion, should graduate schools develop programs that give special emphasis to prepare teachers who will work in speech programs in community colleges? Yes ___ No ___

24. If graduate schools develop programs to prepare teachers to work in community colleges, what would you recommend be included in these programs that is presently missing? (Please comment briefly)

_____

_____

_____

_____

COURSES

25. The average number of sections of the basic speech course each semester is: _____

26. The average class size in the basic speech course is: 35-40__, 30-34__, 25-29__, 20-24__, 15-19__, other__(Please specify)_____

27. Which of the following describes the emphasis of the basic speech course in your speech program:

__a. Communication
__b. Public Speaking
__c. Fundamentals
__d. Multiple
__e. Other (Please specify)_____

28. Does the basic speech course follow a departmental syllabus? Yes ___ No ___

29. Is a written "Statement of Objectives" given to all students who take the basic speech course? Yes ___ No ___

30. If students are given a "Statement of Objectives are these objectives stated in behavioral terms? Yes ___ No ___

31. What is the approximate total number of students who enroll in courses in the speech program each semester or quarter? _____
Of this number, how many are students in courses that deal specifically with theatre or drama? _____

32. Can a student in the speech program of your school take approximately the same speech courses that he would be able to take in the first two years of the program at four year institutions in your area? Yes ___ No ___

33. Does the speech program of your school include any courses other than the parallel, or transfer, courses? Yes ___ No ___ If yes, please give the name(s) of the course(s): _____

_____

34. Does your school offer a Drama Major? Yes ___ No ___

35. Does your school offer a Speech Major? Yes ___ No ___

36. How many total hours of course credit are included in the speech program? _____ Are these (check one): semester hours __, quarter hours __, other __ (Please specify) _____

37. How many different courses does the speech program include? _____

38. Approximately what percentage of the courses in the speech program deal specifically with theatre or drama? 0%__, 20%__, 40%__, 60%__, 80%__, Other__ (Please specify) _____

39. Is a basic course in theatre included in the speech program?
Yes ___ No ___
If yes, is it offered:

__a. once each year
__b. every semester or quarter

ACTIVITIES

40. Does the speech program of your school include a schedule of theatre productions? Yes ___ No ___

41. How many major theatre productions are usually presented during the regular school year? _____

42. Can students earn college credit for participation in theatre productions? Yes ___ No ___

43. Are theatre productions usually presented in:

__a. an improvised facility
__b. a permanent theatre structure
__c. other (Please specify) _____

44. Does the speech program of your school include intercollegiate forensic activities? Yes ___ No ___

45. Can students earn college credit for participation in forensic activities? Yes ___ No ___

46. Approximately what percentage of staff time is used for activities that do not produce student credit hours? 0%__, 20%__, 40%__, 60%__, 80%__, Other__ (Please specify) _____
Is this staff time normally:

__a. part of regular load
__b. overload

THE SPEECH PROGRAM: PERSPECTIVE

47. How would you describe the rationale for the speech program of your college? Please comment: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

48. Do you believe that the "open-door" policy of the comprehensive community college makes special and unusual demands on the speech program? Please comment: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

TABLE 46

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARES

TABLE	QUESTION NUMBER	VARIABLES: SIZE AND REGION	CHI-SQUARE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL
2	1a	Size	.66	1	
	1a	Region	.79	3	
3	2	Size	5.40*	1	X
	2	Region	1.10	3	
4	3	Size	16.65**	5	X
5	4	Size	1.65	1	
	4	Region	15.91**	3	X
6	5	Size	3.38	1	
	5	Region	6.80	3	
7	6	Size	6.63**	1	X
	6	Region	3.40	3	
8	7	Size	.48	1	
	7	Region	4.23	3	
9	8	Size	4.62	3	
	8	Region	4.60	9	
10	9	Size	12.52***	1	X
	9	Region	6.21	3	
	10	Size	2.92	1	
	11	Size	2.80	1	
11	12a	Size	.02	1	
	12a	Region	19.77***	3	X
	12b	Size	1.00	1	
12	13	Size	2.25	1	
	13	Region	17.63***	3	X

TABLE 46 (continued)

TABLE	QUESTION NUMBER	VARIABLES: SIZE AND REGION	CHI-SQUARE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL
13	14	Size	7.85**	1	X
	14	Region	16.50***	3	X
14	15	Size	.31	1	
	15	Region	7.85*	3	X
15	16a	Size	16.50*	6	X
16	16b	Size	7.78**	1	X
	16b	Region	3.71	3	
17	18	Size	1.33	1	
	18	Region	37.72***	3	X
18	19	Size	1.62	1	
	19	Region	.96	3	
19	20	Size	33.40***	1	X
	20	Region	7.29	3	
20	21	Size	10.28	6	
	21	Region	46.17***	18	X
21	21a	Size	20.94***	1	X
	21a	Region	27.76***	3	X
22	22	Size	2.36	1	
	22	Region	5.30	3	
23	23	Size	.30	1	
	23	Region	5.30	3	
24	25	Both	4.06	3	
25	26	Size	9.99	5	
26	27	Size	.33	4	
	27	Region	58.90***	12	X
27	28	Size	1.42	1	
	28	Region	13.67**	3	X

TABLE 46 (continued)

TABLE	QUESTION NUMBER	VARIABLES: SIZE AND REGION	CHI-SQUARE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL
28	29	Size	10.37**	1	X
	29	Region	2.58	3	
29	30	Size	.05	1	
	30	Region	.32	3	
31	32	Size	3.66	1	
32	33	Size	3.57	1	
	33	Region	12.68**	3	X
33	34	Size	3.80	1	
	34	Region	23.45***	3	X
	35	Size	17.11***	1	X
	35	Region	16.76***	3	X
34	36	Both	1.34	3	
35	37	Both	.68	3	
36	38	Size	3.57	3	
37	39a	Size	.58	1	
	39a	Region	14.50**	3	X
	39b	Size	2.71	1	
	39b	Region	14.74**	3	X
38	40	Size	.38	1	
	40	Region	9.57*	3	X
40	42	Size	1.31	1	
	42	Region	31.75***	3	X
41	43	Size	3.84*	1	X
	43	Region	3.79	3	
42	44	Size	4.42*	1	X
	44	Region	21.39***	3	X

TABLE 46 (continued)

TABLE	QUESTION NUMBER	VARIABLES: SIZE AND REGION	CHI-SQUARE	DEGREES OF FREEDOM	SIGNIFICANT AT THE .05 LEVEL
43	45	Size	1.67	1	
	45	Region	34.36***	3	X
44	46	Size	5.11	2	
	46	Region	13.09*	6	X
45	46b	Size	1.81	1	
	46b	Region	6.87	3	

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.
***Significant at the .001 level.

APPENDIX C

DEPARTMENT TITLES

Respondents were asked to specify other department titles, if none of the listed titles were checked (Table 4, p. 33). The following department titles were indicated by the respondents.

1. English-Speech Department
2. Fine Arts
3. Arts and Humanities
4. Humanities Division
5. Social Science, Humanities, Communications Division
6. Speech-Theatre Department
7. Communications
8. Communications-Humanities
9. Speech-Drama-Radio
10. Speech and Theatre Arts
11. English, Speech, and Literature
12. Communication and Theatre
13. Speech, Communications and Linguistics Division
14. Speech Arts Department
15. Visual, Performing, and Communicative Arts
16. Theatre Arts
17. Drama, Radio, TV, Speech Department
18. Department of Languages and Literature
19. Language Arts

20. Communication and Arts
21. Liberal Arts Division
22. Communication Skills, English, Speech Department
23. Creative Arts
24. Speech-Language-Drama Division
25. Communication Arts and Skills Department
26. Speech, Drama, Journalism Department
27. Languages and Speech
28. Fine and Performing Arts

APPENDIX D

FLORISSANT VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
3400 PERSHALL ROAD
St. Louis, Missouri
63135
JAckson 4-2020/Area Code 314

January, 1972

Dear Chairman:

I know that you are probably very busy, and that asking you to complete a questionnaire is an extra demand on your heavy schedule. I am asking for your help because you are a key person in providing information that is greatly needed. Your speech program is an important part of the national growth of community colleges.

The Speech Communication Association recently appointed a committee to explore speech-communication education in community-junior colleges. As chairman of this committee, I want to serve you by making available information on speech programs in community colleges. The enclosed questionnaire, which is part of a PhD dissertation at the University of Missouri, attempts to gather data on these programs.

The information, which can be provided only by you, can help to assess the current status of speech programs in large community colleges across the country. This information can be vitally important to our colleagues who are developing speech programs in new community colleges, and it can help to identify trends and changes that might affect your speech program.

Results will be made available to you through professional association meetings, and almost certainly through professional journals.

I want to thank you in advance for your cooperation, and for the 10 or 15 minutes required to complete and mail the questionnaire. I also

want to ask for your ideas and your support in promoting the professional status of community college speech programs in higher education in general, and in the Speech Communication Association in particular.

Sincerely,

Arthur C. Meyer, Chairman
SCA Committee on Speech and Theatre
in Community Colleges

ACM:jfv

APPENDIX E: RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Graduate School Programs to Prepare Community Colleges Teachers

Three open-ended questions were included in the questionnaire. The first open-ended question was, "If graduate schools develop programs to prepare teachers to work in community colleges, what would you recommend be included in these programs that is presently missing?" Responses to this question included the following:

1. A course in the history of community colleges.
2. More emphasis on speech correction techniques and interpersonal communication.
3. Counseling techniques.
4. Communication theory and principles.
5. Emphasis on teaching skills, on testing and measurement.
6. Broad rather than specialized education.
7. Theatre technician program to train community college students to prepare for local technical theatre jobs.
8. Sociology, to help teachers adapt to the community concept and to ethnic variations.
9. A committment to community college philosophy.
10. Courses that relate directly to the course content in the community college curriculum.
11. Philosophy and curriculum of the community college.
12. Training in techniques to motivate and instruct vocational and minority students.
13. Emphasis on being able to work well with other staff.
14. Black dialects.

15. Methods of teaching and evaluation specifically designed for speech as a social and professional tool of communication. Methodology courses are far too general.

16. Courses and program planning. How to persuade other departments and administration to support speech programs in the community college.

17. Teaching speech to non-speech majors.

18. International communication, communication theory, and general semantics.

19. How to meet the needs of the business man, the housewife, and other typical community residents.

20. An internship supervised jointly by a community college staff member and a university staff member.

21. Teaching and involvement in community college speech activities.

22. Preparation to teach poorly motivated students.

23. How to represent the college in the community.

24. Unique problems of the community college.

25. Teaching speech to students whose level of achievement is below the college transfer level.

26. Increasing efficiency and improving accountability within the college.

27. Study of Afro-American speech and theatre developments and contributions.

28. More training in organizational communication.

29. Preparation for interdisciplinary course work.

30. More work with video tape facilities.

31. Emphasis on teaching skills, not on research.

32. Classroom procedure in teaching basic speech.

33. A course which develops attitudes necessary for community college teaching.

Rationale for Community College Speech Programs

The second open-ended question was, "How would you describe the rationale for the speech program of your college?" Responses to the question included the following:

1. Our students need to learn to communicate, and this we try to teach.
2. Improve self understanding, concept of self, and expression.
3. Speech fundamentals are emphasized.
4. Prepare students for life; emphasis on the funcational as well as the rhetorical approach.
5. We are committed to a speech program that fulfills the goals of the community college.
6. Interpersonal communication to help two year college students communicate more effectively.
7. We endeavor to serve the transfer student and the vocational-technical student.
8. We believe speech communication to be the central facet of man's being and hope that we can serve in teaching him to use it effectively. We see theatre courses as primarily aimed at helping man to appreciate and relate to his environment, i.e., we teach theatre as a liberal art.
9. Courses always set up to meet the demands of college transfer students. Also need adult education community courses, career programs curricula, and general curriculum. More stress on practice, exposure, and frequent performance opportunities than on theory and scholarship.
10. The program should provide an understanding of the inter-relatedness of the communications arts and skills as well as opportunity to provide experiences in as many areas of communication as possible.
11. The speech program aims to prepare students to transfer after two years as speech or drama majors. It also aims to serve the needs of part-time students, day and evening, whose reasons for taking courses are varied.

12. Emphasis on communication; ability to reach others; listening as well as talking.
    Theatre as a way of reaching, thus not a frill nor an activity, but a popular and more direct way of interesting students in communicating with others in any language.

13. To give all students the opportunity to experience and participate in a top flight speech and theatre program.

14. Non existent other than for service courses in public speaking.

15. Our department has decided upon the following paragraph in response: The Department of Communications endeavors to develop student skills in several areas: individual public speaking, group discussions and interaction, debate, oral interpretation, and radio-t.v.-film. Students oriented towards speech science and speech arts are offered the opportunity which may lead to a career in the teaching of speech arts, a career in speech and hearing rehabilitation, group conference leadership, or in radio-t.v.-film.

16. Eighty-five per cent of our students are in career programs. Improved speech ability serves them both vocationally and avocationally. Our students generally are from the lower socio-economic strata of society and find improved communication ability an asset in upward mobility.

17. Mostly service courses for technical curricula and liberal arts transfer students.

18. Oral communication is probably the most important social function of man. Everyday living is next to impossible without an understanding and appreciation of oral communication. Therefore, every student in our college is given at least one semester of exposure to the theory and practice of speech communication.

19. To teach people to speak well in public and to give them a chance to have theatrical experience working on shows or seeing them.

20. We believe a citizen is not fully educated in communication skills without training in a speech program; our program develops self confidence, objectivity, logic, and the desire to serve.

21. One of the most important subjects they will take in college.

22. Speech is the primary means of communications. It behooves all to communicate clearly, accurately and effectively on a one to one basis, in groups, and in other more formal acts of addressing an audience. Communication skills include listening as well as speaking.

23. We hope that a student in our speech program has ample opportunity to:

    a. become better able to communicate in the kinds of professional and social situations in which he will find himself;

    b. become better able to listen discriminatively to speeches and to judge any attempt to influence him;

    c. participate in the mind-expanding activities of forensics and theatre;

    d. begin a major in speech and/or theatre.

24. Rationale for speech programs in any educational program has remained almost unchanged since ancient times, particularly in a democracy. Students need to be aware of the content, skills, and attitudes related to speech communication.

25. Communication skills and awareness are necessary requisites for modern living. Our strong emphasis on drama provides students with enrichment and training for their lives.

26. To provide a sound two-year speech program for speech majors and a variety of electives for transfer and terminal students.

27. It provides the oral communication courses required for such majors as business, education, and nursing, as well as for occasional speech majors or minors.

28. We attempt to satisfy students' needs as they relate to the various functions of the community college.

29. To provide courses used as electives in other curricula, to satisfy requirements prescribed by other curricula, to provide lower division courses for students who major or minor in speech or drama.

30. To help bridge the communication gap between the theoretical and the actual.

31. We aim at personal improvement, increase in confidence and appreciation of all speech arts.

32. Speech courses are emphasized in an official awareness of the accentuated need for clear communication.

33. Free men must control their own lives. The only form of control consistent with the principle of freedom for all is speech. The degree to which students gain control of their facility is the degree to which they are free. Such freedom must be exercised within a society. I want students to learn how to learn from one another about the human mystery that is speech.

34. To give students a basis for transfer to 4-year colleges and to give 2-year students a program which satisfies their needs.

35. Necessary!

36. This department exists to provide an environment in which students from all elements of the community served by this college may receive skill-training and exposure to knowledge which will make a continuing contribution to their ability to function as responsible, self-sustaining, contributing members of society.

37. From an administrative standpoint: to provide some meagre speech programs because someone said "Real" colleges have them. But to keep speech at a minimum because it is not really important. And everyone knows how to speak. From a department standpoint: the speech program can touch each and every student. Students need background in oral communication, or communication in general. A viable program needs to be built and touch on all facets of communication: interpersonal, public speaking, non-verbal, etc.

38. Complete lower division speech program.

39. We are primarily interested in teaching non-speech majors and minors how to effectively handle themselves in the public speaking situation.

40. Breadth, quality, choice, practicality.

41. Chaotic. We are in a state of flux. Basic theories of the best are being challenged. Much experimentation. Little staff agreement.

42. Our department tries to offer students the opportunity to learn effective oral communication techniques and rhetoric. Classes must qualify the student to perform well at a four year college; so we tend to be academically oriented rather than just an unstructured course in talking.

43. To provide a flexible program for both "interested" students, and students in other departments, as well as transfer courses for university-bound students.

44. Oral communication is far more relevant and important as a skill than is written communication. Speech can focus specifically on structure and content, whereas English tends to focus on style.

45. It is communication and dialogue centered, rather than rhetorically or theoretically-centered.

46. To help students become more effective in oral communication.

47. Preparation for realistic life situations for the non-major. Preparation for careers for the major.

48. Provide opportunity to any student to help achieve improved self-image and self-awareness through successful oral communication experiences.

49. We provide a well rounded general education program that satisfies both major and non-major needs of students.

50. Traditional: we are developing in areas of the vocational/technical communication needs of the community.

51. Theatre is a significant and vital art form. Radio-T.V. is of growing importance in our culture. Oral communication is the key to our survival.

52. I'm not sure we have "a" rationale. Rather we have a variety of them centering around the idea of providing the student what he may need in oral communication once he completes a program of study. This varies to some extent between Arts and Science students, many of whom are pre-professional, and vocational-technical students who have a definite objective in mind.

53. Improved ability in the communication process is a prime requisite in today's society. However, in our department we remain conservative, understanding communication as a process

of creative thinking, planning, research, preparation, and effective delivery. All art demands a practiced technique. We continue to provide such opportunity.

54. Generally for college transfer; night courses designed for adult education but are transferable. Also to provide a program of speech activities.

55. To teach the basic communication skills, personality growth, and awareness. Involvement in productions and activities.

56. Our program is just getting off the ground. We have concentrated our efforts in developing a sound basic communications course. Oral interpretation is our lead-in course to the drama program. Public Speaking is a course for those students, both transfer and career, who feel the need to learn more in-depth skills of speech.
We are trying to meet the needs of both career and transfer students. We foresee a program in speech and drama which will allow a transfer student to make great advances here (with courses and experience) before moving to the 4-year campus; and will allow the community person to take courses and participate in speech activities.

57. The program is primarily aimed toward communication of ideas, and concerned with the two year student in either transfer or terminal programs.

58. Both the curricular and extracurricular programs are tied together to help the transfer majors in the field and to provide an elective of interest to other students. The programs try to gear themselves to the community college student.

59. Since we do not have a formal speech "Program," our courses in speech are geared toward developing the individual's ability to relate to others both on and off campus. Personal development is the focus.

60. We are attempting to help the students to better understand communication and to become better communicators, and also to improve skills in research, preparation, support, critical thinking and analysis, and rhetorical criticism. We also attempt to develop skills in public speaking.

61. Through the study of speech and drama the student enlarges his capacity to express himself and at the same time develops his ability to comprehend and appreciate the creative efforts of others. Through such achievements the student learns ways of living a better, more responsible, and productive life, commensurate with his fullest potential.

62. Ours is a program designed to meet the needs of the academically oriented student who anticipates completing a college degree and the community student who desires to work in this department for his professional development. We offer career training for the serious radio student and preparatory work for the professionally minded theatre student.

63. Our fundamentals is a basic course for most of our students, aimed at improving their communication skills. Other courses are haphazard, as the English department sees fit to use them. We are dominated by the English program.

64. By and large transfer oriented.

65. The fundamentals courses offer a similar level of speech and theatre training as would be found in a four year institution. In addition to this transfer need, experience in debate, forensics and theatre production add a dimension of utilization of classroom skills. Advanced courses are available for those who have the interest.

66. Primary objectives of basic speech course:

    a. Improve students' ability to speak persuasively and informatively as evidenced by organization, employing standard methods of research, selecting relevant supporting materials, effective delivery;

    b. Improve students' ability to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate. In technical courses emphasis in on group discussion, role playing, conducting meetings, brief informative speeches. All activities geared towards functioning in the business world.

67. Clear, accurate and animated oral communication.

68. Our basic speech skills are taught by the Freshman Rhetoric instructors. We offer advanced speech courses to our arts and science students. We also offer basic speech courses for many of the vocation-technical programs.

69. Our "Business and Professions" speech course is now a requirement for all Business Administration students. They have elected to make it a requirement because they feel it is a very vital course in their curriculum.

70. The rationale for the speech program of this college is the same as at any other college. The objectives are to help students to develop an understanding of the art forms of theatre, drama, television, and motion pictures and to organize, analyze, and deliver well-developed original speeches.

71. There is such ineptness in oral communication among the majority of our students that a failure of our college to provide such needed skills would be unthinkable. The emphasis tends, however, to be placed upon written skills as has always been the case, in spite of the fact that oral communication is equally, if not more, vital in today's world.

72. To articulate one's thoughts and to understand the principles of discourse, and to provide the opportunity to practice frequently. To discuss the principles of rhetoric, purposeful discourse, and speech performance.

73. Man is a socially-oriented animal who can selectively communicate. It is the purpose of our program to allow a student to realistically confront communication experiences in order to allow him to better understand his role and responsibilities in the process of communication.

74. To provide a well-rounded lower division education for those who plan to continue their education and to provide opportunities for individuals to develop communication or dramatic skills.

75. Our speech-communication program is essentially "communication" in philosophy. It attempts to give the student reality-based experiences in exploring his communicative self, relating it to others in encountering other selves, and manipulating other selves to meet his physical and psychological needs in a rewarding manner.

76. At the moment it serves no other purpose than to fulfill graduation requirements and to offer electives to students interested in an oral communications course. The Play Production course is at the moment the basis for our major productions and student one-acts.

77. A necessary and vital part of the two year community college education. Most students have had no previous speech experience.

78. To help the students from different curricula to explore the areas of communication endemic to their areas. The primary rationale for the speech program is to provide the theory

and the application of oral communication principles for improvement of liberal arts students' communication ability.

79. Communication and types of speeches are stressed. Closely related to composition objectives.

80. Essentially we are offering a transfer oriented program to our students with options in speech, speech science, and theatre.

81. The over-all objective is to introduce the basic theories of speech-communication and to provide practical experience in speaking in interpersonal, group, and public situations.

82. The basis of communication theory and performance for speech students; basic theatre skills and drama literature background for theatre majors.

83. Help students develop confidence in self as communicating human beings. Give students ideas of related areas of communication in music, profanity, rumor, etc.

84. To provide opportunities to deliver different types of speeches to different kinds of audiences.

85. Three-fourths of our program is purely elective, although we stress the parallel status for those who intend to go on to a four year school. Our rationale is that everyone needs to communicate, to achieve skills, to have constructive experiences.

86. We have found that many of our graduates of technical fields must communicate orally when they are working. Therefore, we emphasize the importance of speech, and developing self-confidence, in each individual when confronted with a public speaking engagement.

87. As both a service department for all-college use as well as a first step toward upper-division work for those going on in speech as a major interest.

88. To provide students with relevant courses to meet the student's immediate and long range goals.

89. Designed to fit the needs of all students, with emphasis on technical, occupational majors.

90. Give the students experience in various areas of vocal communication, thus preparing them for more effectiveness in any situation they may face.

91. Through a "systematic approach" the department tries to reach students from a variety of different cultural and ethnic background to enable them to understand and master the art of human communication.

92. To help students organize and communicate their ideas to others.

93. It is designed to help:

    a. the student who will get all his speech training during his first two years of college;

    b. for those students who plan to transfer to a senior college and pursue a degree in some speech-related field.

94. In a community with a constant and increasing need for effective communication, speech offers part of the solution to problems in intrapersonal, interpersonal, and group-communication.

95. Our speech and drama courses are considered as part of our general education program, fulfilling both a terminal and a transfer function. A minimal amount of speech therapy is made available in our learning laboratory; referal service is available.

96. Student develops greater sensitivity and skill in interpersonal, intrapersonal and public communication skills.

97. To provide techniques of oral communication; analysis of individual strengths and weaknesses, management of ideas in informative and persuasive speaking, their conception, development, organization, oral presentation, and evaluation.

98. We are all communicators. We can all improve in personal, social, business, and professional communication. We stress daily use, as well as professional aspects. We give much individualized attention.

99. Being a community college, it is part of our "a place for everyone" rationale. Also, 80 per cent of our students have never had a speech class, not to mention forensic participation. Forensics helps our students establish an identity they may not have otherwise.

100. Try to duplicate local four year transfer program, plus remedial and career possibilities in speech.

101. To provide the college student with a background in speech and theatre activities to harden him intellectually, culturally, personally.

102. Based on the needs of the student as he takes his place in the world of work. It is also considered as a tool in giving the student confidence in himself.

103. We provide a large number of basic courses for both vocational and academic transfer. In addition we offer a limited number of other freshman-sophomore courses. We would like all students to be introduced to basic speech communication.

104. Improvement of the communicative process is the primary objective of speech classes. Enrichment, sensitivity, humanism are the primary objectives of the theatre-drama classes.

105. Because our college is an open-door school, we have students with many degrees of proficiency (or lack of proficiency) in communication skills. Because of this, we have established our fundamentals course primarily as a skill course endeavoring to bring up oral communication effectiveness to a minimum standard of proficiency. The exceptional student is permitted to take higher level courses rather than the fundamentals course. We are not trying to be remedial, but rather to develop greater confidence, ability to organize, and an awareness of the intricate complexity of human communication.

106. Our basic communication course is planned to help:

a. the student to understand the importance of communication to his success as an individual in his professional world;

b. to discover the relationship between intrapersonal communication and interpersonal communication;

c. to establish beneficial interpersonal relationships with others in order to effectively persuade, inform, and motivate others;

d. to develop the ability to organize and express ideas more effectively in one-to-one, one-to-a-small-group, or one-to-an-audience. This is the basic rationale underlying the variety of courses that we teach.

107. To serve as a support program for other curriculum that feel there is a necessity to communicate effectively. Also to enable the student to communicate more effectively on intrapersonal, interpersonal, and public levels.

108. The Speech Arts program serves three general functions. First, it provides for the transfer student planning a career in one of the specific areas of rhetoric, public address, communications, theatre and communicative disorders. Second, the program offers a variety of general education courses as part of the curriculum designed to give students experiences in the liberal arts. Third, courses are provided in communication skills for the terminal student.
Specific programs are designed for speech arts majors dependent upon their individual educational and professional goals.

109. Helter skelter.

110. It's our purpose to make the student better aware of the complexities of the communication process and to better understand themselves as communicators, both as senders and as receivers.

111. Aside from the cultural and aesthetic awareness searched for, the speech program attempts to eliminate whatever separation exists between speaker and listener. To live with one's fellowman we feel this is necessary.

112. The defining characteristic of the human being is his ability and need to communicate symbolically with his own kind. Verbal communication is the most common type of communication man employs. We try to facilitate this type of communication and to channel it into humanly valuable objectives.

113. All students attending our college must take a basic speech course in order to obtain any one of the four degrees offered. It seems apparent in our daily lives that our communication processes are not adequate. Communication-interaction is stressed, practicality is stressed. We do not all need to become great orators perhaps, but we all could improve communication to aid us in our self concept, concept of others, enjoyment of life, and problem solving among men.

114. We are presently under-enrolled and think that perhaps we need a new rationale. It has been traditionally "public speaking." Theatre is all new this year. Interpretation is just beginning this year as a program. Community Relations is a rapidly growing area.

Influence of the Open-Door Policy on the Community College Speech Program

The third open-ended question was, "Do you believe that the 'open-door' policy of the comprehensive community college makes special and unusual demands on the speech program?" Responses to this question included the following:

1. It certainly does! Many people cannot even pronounce words and backgrounds are very shallow.

2. Yes. The attending comments would fill a novel or biography or history.

3. Yes. Majority of students have never had a speech course. If their English background is poor, it is reflected in their speech organization. No doubt there are some students who don't belong in college. Students' attitude has to be made positive. Students are afraid to take speech.

4. It makes demands, but not unusual. Speech people should be able to contribute to this policy.

5. No special or unusual demands. The speech program is essentially based on individual needs.

6. There is also a need for compensatory, or remedial, programs for students with special needs.

7. Yes. I think we have special tasks to serve the developmental and vocational students and special committments to our communities. At our college we have not met these special demands yet, but I believe they are waiting our attention.

8. Yes. Speech courses must emphasize practical aspects of improving oral communication for every day use, less stress on voice and diction, oration.

9. No. We have a body of knowledge to be used personally and individually according to our own environments, which in turn provide us with our unique behavioral attitudes and patterns. But communication theory and speech effectiveness remain the same.

10. Yes. It is a challenge to offer speech courses that challenge the most able, while providing additional help for the less able student. The rang of ability and preparation is probably greater in the open-door policy of the college than in the college with restricted enrollment.

11. Yes, definitely. One section of Speech 131 assignments may be done in Spanish rather than English if the student chooses, and two-thirds of the class does so choose.

12. Definitely. Different background and goals require different orientation.

13. Only in terms of foreign accent students, and larger percentages of students who need work generally in pronunciation and articulation.

14. The open admissions policy now in effect does present special problems, which haven't yet been considered to any degree in this college's speech program. Many students need remedial work, speech and accent correction, but this is only offered here in written English at present.

15. Yes. The tremendous differences in background and ability of students make the job of the department, and particularly the instructor, a much more demanding and sensitive one.

16. Yes. It must be less academic and more pragmatic.

17. Naturally there are different demands. Students are with you such a short time that public performances are difficult. The open-door policy probably brings in more students who need some kind of help.

18. Yes. It brings in students who really need speech to develop a positive self image.

19. No. Not if one understands and teaches speech communication to every student no matter what his background is. I believe students call it relevant.

20. No. Just that teachers are expected to teach, as well as to advise, and to work with individual students more than just with the class.

21. Yes. But probably no more than in most subject areas. The open-door policy admits students who in other years would not be considered college material. Their feeling of inadequacy can be especially acute in speech. Increased self-respect and self-realization are desirable outcomes for all students who take speech courses.

22. Yes. There are many special and unusual demands on the speech instructor in an open-door policy community college. He must recognize effective communication in spite of dialectic and linguistic deficiencies, and give the student credit for his real ability. He must continue to demonstrate so called standard English, and to convince the student of its value in a competitive society. Stigma must be removed from the bi-lingualism of minority groups who wish to succeed in white society, and maintain a place in their previous society.

23. Yes. Our program must be of a broader range than the specialized, select school. We must provide opportunities for students at broader levels.

24. Obviously, the students are neither as bright nor as well motivated, as students in a school with a closed door policy.

25. Yes. The wide range of ability in many areas of endeavor, and the vast range of motivation, present a special challenge.

26. Yes. Open door policy insures a constant flow of unmotivated, inadequately educated, persons.

27. Of course. Kids are weak readers and are sensitive to the brutalities of an authoritarian school system. They won't learn from a standard textbook reading, lecture, and performance approach.

28. Of course. It creates problems of ever-increasing numbers, over-crowding, and large class sizes. It necessitates constant revision of curriculum and course structure to meet ever-changing demographic patterns. It imposes the necessity for extra expenditure of time and energy to maintain high levels of achievement, and to insure articulation with upper division institutions. It is, however, completely consistent with our committment to the concept of education for all American youth, and is, by far, the most viable and exciting element of higher education in the country.

29. Compared with a four year school, yes. That's why teachers in community colleges need some special training. From the standpoint of what a community college should do, the demands are just. But the real demand is to make the administration recognize the need for a viable communication program as opposed to exhibition-type of a public address and forensic program that can be showed to the community for applause.

30. We started a special course for vocational students and found that they preferred the regular transfer class. We do, however, gear the fundamentals class to special groups, law enforcement, nursing, etc.

31. Yes. But we feel that the students gain much more from their speech experience than any other required subject in our college. The non-speech majors and minors are a joy to work with.

32. Yes. We must adapt to many different levels of skills, knowledge, and age.

33. The open-door policy makes unusual demands in that there are too many educationally uninvolved students looking for easy classes. We try to get these students into terminal classes and keep the speech program more academically oriented.

34. Yes. The preparation level of students is so wide that one doesn't know where to begin, or which ideas to cover.

35. The open-door means that all faculty must be able to work with non-academic students, as well as with the traditional college students. Requires an alteration of approach in conduct of in-class and out-of-class behavior. The personal relationship becomes more important.

36. Yes. Students come from a variety of backgrounds, some of which place a low premium on communication.

37. Yes. We must be prepared to meet all students' needs, both from a personal, individual viewpoint for growth as a person, and from the vocation-professional viewpoint.

38. No. Except for teaching methods which must adapt to all kinds of students.

39. Yes. We must be more willing to be flexible in our program, and meet both transfer and terminal needs of our students.

40. It certainly does. Our students range from the poorly prepared to the well-prepared, those who have had no oral communication training to those who have had three years, those who did not complete school or completed it in the bottom quartile of their class, those (rarely) who have graduated with highest known honors from high school.

41. It certainly does. As the caliber of a student decreases, the challenge to the instructor increases. It is increasingly difficult to motivate the student to want to read, to plan, to organize, to practice, and to become an effective speaker. In short, we feel we must help the student overcome inadequacies caused by a permissive educational approach.

42. Yes, multitude of backgrounds and interests. Commuter college also presents problems in group orientated speech activities such as panel discussion.

43. Yes. Backgrounds and previous training are widely varied, as are student goals, needs, and objectives.

44. The range of ambitions is extremely broad within each class.

45. Special, but advantageous, because we can incorporate the entire community into our projects. We will not limit our theatre programs only to students, for example, but include community people also. Our speech classes use the community for an audience.

46. Yes. We have students with problems in oral communication. On the other hand, sometimes we reach students with problems and give them an incentive to continue in college.

47. Because of the varying backgrounds of students that the open-door policy invites, a basic speech course must meet these varying backgrounds. A common ground must be discovered and established from which the courses can develop.

48. Open-door policy permits less committed students to occupy space in all classes. The frequent lack of sincere committment is distressing, but not limited to speech classes.

49. Yes, very much so. We are developing a program now for the technically oriented student. The courses must be different from university parallel courses.

50. Speech and theatre courses must spend a lot of time orienting students to the basic nature of communication. The level of experience and competency is often so low that courses become remedial rather than exploratory or skill oriented.

51. Yes. It is a greater challenge for instructors to take less talented students in speech and drama and achieve goals of progress. We accept this challenge with the attitude that we are here to serve the student, and not the reverse.

52. Most emphatically yes. The open-door policy permits students who would be denied entrance to some institutions. To meet the needs of these students, special programs must be devised. Instruction becomes almost a one-to-one affair, and instructors must be willing to assume responsibility for their students' learning. Programs must be flexible. Materials that can be adapted to the individual's abilities must be used to encourage the slow learner and to challenge the fast learner. Instructors must be willing to teach, and to devote their time to teaching, leaving behind any desire to conduct research, to publish, or to languish in the prestige of being a college professor. Here the discipline is brought to the student, not the student to the discipline. Our administration is of the opinion that, where there has been no learning, there has been no teaching.

53. Very often a community college offers a second chance to the low achiever in high school. Many students have poor ability in communication skills. Further, the low achiever usually has a low image of himself, and this is reflected in his speaking patterns. Many students enter the speech classroom with a history of failure, and assume this failure will continue. Building self-confidence is quite a task for the speech teacher in a community college.

54. It makes the practical more important than the theoretical. The emphasis must be put on performance.

55. No unusual demands on the program, other than instructors must teach students how to translate traditional speech into a more relevant vehicle for their needs in their particular communities.

56. Yes. In dealing with students at all academic and age levels, there must be a broader base to teaching, and more adaptation to varying needs than at an institution which limits its enrollment.

57. Yes. It must be less ivory tower. It must confront realistically the world in which the student lives and communicates.

58. The particular demand that might be different from a four year institution is to provide the variety of communication training needed for transfer and terminal students. A public speaking orientation does not fulfill the needs.

59. No. My experience at a four year college and at the community college show little significant difference.

60. Yes. The wide range of student abilities makes the learning process slow at times. Age span is great and application of concepts sometimes is difficult. The speech program serves the community as a vibrant force in the college.

61. Our open-door policy demands that each section be treated individually. Consequently our syllabi and outlines are quite broad allowing considerable individual freedom. We also find prerequisites unworkable, and all courses offered are elective and open.

62. It could, depending upon the segment of the population that the majority of the college's students come from. But, unless a school is primarily serving a community that has widespread speech difficulties, I see no reason why an open-door policy should create special or unusual demands upon the speech program. It hasn't in our own institution.

63. Yes. Because of the wide level of experiences and preparation of students taking the courses. A considerable mixture of age groups is also common in the basic speech course.

64. No. We still have a number of good students from within our service area who come with speech and drama background. Our problem is having students for only two years.

65. Yes. Many students commute from some distances. Many have part or full-time jobs, which limit or preclude their participation in drama.

66. Definitely yes. Many misfits want into activities for the sak of nothing better to do. Intelligence for forensic activities is limited.

67. Yes. Many students do not have pre-requisites. Most work, and are not available for rehearsal. Most do not major in speech.

68. We take students interested in forensics and give them a chance. We feel the travel serves as an educational experience, along with the tournament competition. The biggest problem is letting students know of our activities, and that they are welcome to participate.

69. Yes. We need and offer courses in remedial speech.

70. Yes. In a largely urban area institution, many low socio-economic students attend, and they require many special-aid programs. Students frequently require speech correction, rather than orientation to communication, or public speaking.

71. Some students are not used to appearing before a group and this has to be overcome. Otherwise I do not believe there are unusual demands.

72. Yes. We have students who differ tremendously in aptitude, interest and skills. Much more so, I feel, than the four year schools face.

73. Yes. The spread between the top academic students and those at the bottom is great, probably greater than a four year institution.

74. Yes. I do believe that the open-door policy of the comprehensive community college makes unusual demands on speech programs. The wide variety of ages, interests, and abilities of our students requires much special guidance and counseling. And a teacher, to be effective, must have many academic approaches to meet the divergent needs. Also, we teach many speech courses related to vocational areas. This requires a basic knowledge of the communication needs of the particular profession, and a tailoring of your course to meet these needs.

75. The biggest demand is filling in deficiencies in the student's background. The open-door policy provides us with many students who are unprepared for college in general, and for what our department requires in specific.

76. Yes. We are all things to all people.

77. Yes. Everyone arrives with different needs and competency levels, and must be treated on an individual basis. Instructors must understand this, and conduct their classes accordingly.

78. Frankly, no. Other than being very challenging, the student is most receptive to our speech courses. The open door policy gives us a tremendous variety of students.

79. Motivation is a big concern, to the instructor. Many students have just dropped in, and are not motivated to give a speech. Low verbal skills also present problems. Students who do not belong in a basic class are enrolled every quarter. There is a large dropout rate and some loss of time and effort in class.

80 I think it is a problem with less motivated students. I think their abilities are not so much of a problem if standards are set, performance required, and punitive grading systems eliminated.